



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, JUNE 3, 2013

No. 76

Senate

The Senate met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the Honorable TIMOTHY M. KAINE, a Senator from the Commonwealth of Virginia.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

O God, thank You for being near to us in good and bad times. We celebrate Your wonderful blessings that bring us new victories each day.

As we look at the flowers on the desk of our friend and brother, Senator FRANK LAUTENBERG, we thank You for his life and legacy. As we mourn his death, send Your comfort into our hearts. Bless Bonnie and his family and give them Your peace. Let our memory of this good and courageous American inspire us to transcend the barriers that divide us and to work for the good of America.

We pray in Your merciful Name.
Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable TIMOTHY M. KAINE led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, June 3, 2013.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable TIMOTHY M. KAINE, a

Senator from the Commonwealth of Virginia, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. KAINE thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

MOMENT OF SILENCE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate observe a moment of silence in honor of the late FRANK LAUTENBERG, a Senator from the State of New Jersey.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will have a moment of silence.

If all will please stand.
(Moment of silence.)

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, there are a few matters I must take care of. We will be in morning business until 4 p.m. Following that, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 954, the farm bill.

At 5:30 p.m. there will be two rollcall votes on amendments to that bill.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—H.R. 3 AND H.R. 271

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I understand there are two bills at the desk due for a second reading.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The leader is correct. The clerk will read the titles of the bills for a second time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3) to approve the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Keystone XL pipeline, and for other purposes.

A bill (H.R. 271) to clarify that compliance with an emergency order under section 202(c)

of the Federal Power Act may not be considered a violation of any Federal, State, or local environmental law or regulation, and for other purposes.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I object to further proceedings with regard to both of these matters.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection having been heard, the measures will now be placed on the calendar.

REMEMBERING FRANK R. LAUTENBERG

Mr. REID. Mr. President, when I learned early this morning that FRANK LAUTENBERG had died, of course, I immediately became very sad. I served with him for 2½ decades or more in the Senate.

I see there are flowers on his desk. It seems the flowers have barely wilted on the desk—which is right behind me—of Senator Inouye. So I have a heavy heart.

As we all know, the senior Senator from New Jersey and my friend FRANK LAUTENBERG died this morning. My thoughts are with his lovely wife Bonnie, his children, and 13 grandchildren.

Few people in the history of this institution contributed as much to this Nation and to the Senate as FRANK LAUTENBERG. His success story is what the American dream is all about.

He came from a family of working-class immigrants from Eastern Europe—Russia and Poland. His parents struggled. I heard FRANK talk about how they struggled. They worked so hard. They moved around New Jersey often.

When FRANK was 18, during the middle of World War II he enlisted in the U.S. Army. During World War II he served with distinction in the Army Signal Corps. I can remember FRANK talking about his experiences in the European theater. While he was in the Army Signal Corps, he said he could

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S3887

see the war going on in his sight while he was up on a wooden power pole.

He talked about the many experiences he had during World War II, as he said, making him a better American. He was very proud of his military service. He is the last World War II veteran having served in the Senate. We don't have any World War II veterans anymore. His death is a great loss to this institution in many different ways.

When FRANK came home from the war—he was obviously very smart—he was permitted to attend the very prestigious Columbia University. He did it, of course, on the GI bill—just as so many of the other returning Americans did.

He quickly founded his own company. He started the company with two boyhood friends. All three kids were from New Jersey. Under his leadership, his firm, Automatic Data Processing, known as ADP, grew into the largest computing company of its kind in the world.

He was so very proud of that company, and he never hesitated to tell everyone that he made money. He became rich. He was a poor boy who became wealthy as a result of being able to fulfill his dreams, as people can do, in America.

FRANK wasn't content with his personal success alone. He was proud of the civic and charitable things he did, but nothing made him more proud of what he did outside government than when he served as the top lay leader of the United Jewish Appeal, known as the Jewish Federations of North America. He was very proud of that.

FRANK LAUTENBERG was known for many things before he came to the Senate. He ran an impossible race for the Senate and was elected. He came to the Congress in 1982, the same year I did. Over the course of three decades he worked tirelessly on behalf of his State and the country.

He retired once. He could not stand retirement. He hated retirement. He could not stay away from public service, and he returned to the Senate in 2002.

He had a remarkable career. I just touched upon a few of his accomplishments. He had determination that made him successful in the private sector and also served him well in the Senate. Motivated by his own experience, Senator LAUTENBERG, a World War II veteran, cowrote the 21st century GI bill of rights. Recognizing how much this meant to him, he wanted to ensure that the vets returning from Iraq and Afghanistan enjoyed the same opportunities for education that helped him become so successful.

My youngest boy just hated cigarette smoke, and it really made him ill. There was a time when people could smoke everywhere in the airplane and then finally in a different part of the airplane; however, it didn't matter. Everybody sucked in the secondhand smoke.

FRANK LAUTENBERG took care of my boy and millions of other people who

would no longer have to suck in that smoke in an airplane. He is the one, more than anyone else, whom we have to thank for protecting us from deadly secondhand smoke in an airplane because his legislation banned smoking on airplanes.

He was also a long-time member of the Environment and Public Works Committee. Had he not retired in that very short period of time that he did, he would have been chairman of that committee. However, because he wasn't there, I had the opportunity to be chair of that committee on two separate occasions.

He focused on this Nation's infrastructure, such as roads and highways. One of the ideas he thought would make this country a much safer place was to pass a drinking limit so a person could not drink alcohol anywhere in the country until they were 21 years of age. It was called a national drunk driving standard.

He believed in helping the State of New Jersey as well as helping the country, but I am not sure in which order. It was hard to understand the difference because he was focused on the country and New Jersey at the same time.

FRANK wanted to make sure that women and children were protected from gun violence. Thanks to him, we passed legislation that convicted domestic abusers so they could not own firearms.

Those are just a few examples of his work in the Senate that literally saved lives. He came from his sick bed—in a wheelchair—to vote on gun legislation. He agreed with 90 percent of the American people—that people who had severe mental problems or were felons should not be able to buy guns. He agreed with 90 percent of the American people.

He came from his bed to be here and vote with us. He was so happy to be here. After that, he came once—just a few days ago—to vote when we needed him again. He tried so hard.

When I talked to Bonnie today, she said he was confident he would live to be 100. He was a very strong man physically.

A couple years ago, I took a big delegation to China. It was a bipartisan group. It was a wonderful trip. For FRANK LAUTENBERG, that was his last foreign travel. I can remember indicating what a strong man he was physically. I had never been to the Great Wall of China. I don't know how many of the other 10 Senators had been there, but I had not. It is pretty steep, and there are big rocks that have been there for centuries and centuries. Because FRANK was 88 years old at the time, somebody grabbed his arm to help him go up. He pushed them away. He wanted no help from anybody. He was on his own, and that is the way he wanted to be.

I and our Nation owe a great debt of gratitude to FRANK for his outstanding service. He had always been so kind to

me. He was someone who appreciated serving. He appreciated being here. He loved being in the Senate, and the Nation is going to miss his strength and his progressive leadership.

The other attribute that probably a lot of people didn't know about FRANK LAUTENBERG was his sense of humor. I always had him tell stories because no one could tell a story like him. Another reason I liked FRANK is he laughed at his own jokes. He thought they were funny, as did most everyone who listened to them.

One of our favorite jokes was about two wrestlers. It would take 5 minutes or more to tell the story, but it was hilarious. No one could tell it like FRANK. He had a sense of humor, and we certainly appreciated that. Even though the Senate has AL FRANKEN, there was room for two funny people prior to FRANK's death this morning. FRANK LAUTENBERG—and AL FRANKEN—always made us smile and often made us laugh. Now I guess it is going to be up to Senator FRANKEN to do this alone, because they were both funny, together and apart.

It is with deep sadness that his Senate family is going to say goodbye. We are going to do that Wednesday morning. We will say goodbye to an exemplary public servant and a faithful friend, Senator FRANK LAUTENBERG.

I note the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 4 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Thank you, Mr. President. If the Acting President pro tempore will let me know when I have used 10 minutes, I would appreciate it.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will so notify the Senator.

Mr. ALEXANDER. If no other Senator is on the floor, I will continue.

REMEMBERING FRANK R. LAUTENBERG

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I am here today to speak on clean energy independence, but before I do that

I want to note the passing of Senator FRANK LAUTENBERG.

When I came to the Senate 10 years ago, there were a number of Members here who were veterans of World War II. Now there are none. Senator LAUTENBERG was the last. He was a member of the generation often described as the greatest.

He was the son of immigrants. He made a lot of money in business as an entrepreneur in the American dream. Then he did another entrepreneurial thing: He ran for the U.S. Senate and served twice here. He was an advocate for the things he believed in, and he was a productive Senator. Just in the last couple of weeks he helped to fashion an agreement on amending the Toxic Substances Control Act, of which I am a cosponsor. It has been a long time coming, and he had a major role in that.

We will miss him. To his wife Bonnie and to his family, they have my respect and condolences and admiration for his long service to our country.

CLEAN ENERGY INDEPENDENCE

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, 5 years ago I spoke at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory. I began with a story from our past about our future. It is a familiar story to those of us in Tennessee.

President Franklin Roosevelt called the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee into his office in 1942 and said: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask you to hide a couple billion dollars in the budget for a secret project to win the war.

Senator McKellar replied: Mr. President, I just have one question: Where in Tennessee would you like me to hide it?

That place turned out to be Oak Ridge. That was how Tennessee became one of the sites where scientists worked to build the atomic bomb before the Germans.

I suggested 5 years ago that we have a new Manhattan Project—really mini-Manhattan Projects for clean energy independence.

Last week at Oak Ridge, 5 years after that first speech, I suggested four grand principles to help us chart a competitive energy future for the next 5 years to end our obsession with taxpayer subsidies and strategies for expensive energy and instead focus on doubling government-sponsored research and allowing marketplace solutions to create an abundance of cheap, clean, reliable energy. I would like to renew those comments today on the floor of the Senate. The four grand principles I mentioned were, No. 1, cheaper, not more expensive, energy; No. 2, clean, not just renewable, energy; No. 3, research and development, not government mandates; and No. 4, the free market, not the government, picking winners and losers.

The seven grand challenges I suggested 5 years ago were grounded in

challenges from the U.S. National Academy of Engineering. My challenges included making plug-in electric vehicles more commonplace, finding ways to capture and use carbon, helping solar become cost-competitive, safely managing nuclear waste, encouraging cellulosic biofuels, making new buildings green buildings, and creating energy from fusion.

My goal in laying out those seven challenges was clean energy independence. At the time, some took issue with the idea of a grand goal underlying these challenges, but I thought independence was a good goal then, and it is a good goal now because the United States should not be held hostage by any other country because of our energy needs.

Since I spoke 5 years ago, the Department of Energy has established the energy innovation hubs that are producing fuels from sunlight and advancing nuclear reactor and battery technologies. That, paired with the work of the new energy research agency—which we call ARPA-E—and others, has moved us forward on my seven grand challenges in a number of ways. Let me summarize that briefly.

Electric vehicles sales are approaching 100,000 in the United States, and ARPA-E has helped a company that has doubled the energy density of lithium-ion batteries.

Carbon capture. We are developing commercial uses for carbon dioxide, such as liquid fuels produced from microbes.

Solar power. Though the goal is around \$1 per watt installed by 2020, the cost has fallen from \$8 to \$4 per watt in the past five years. It still has a long way to go, but it is promising.

Nuclear waste. Four of us in the Senate have drafted comprehensive nuclear waste legislation. For the first time in 30 years, we are building new large reactors, and we are moving forward on small modular nuclear reactors.

Advanced biofuels. There are three new bioenergy research centers that are developing next-generation bioenergy crops for industrial-scale production.

Green buildings. Research and development has meant 20 new commercial products in energy efficiency.

Fusion. We have already demonstrated human-engineered fusion on a small scale, and now we are trying to scale it up for commercial energy production.

The United States has made gains, but we still have challenges. Even as other parts of the world grow rapidly, the U.S. still uses about 20 percent of the world's energy, and the Energy Information Administration estimates that our country's energy demand will increase more than 10 percent by 2040.

Second, we have record oil and gas production at home, but we need to be as independent as possible from those who might want to use our demand for oil to hold us hostage. Former Sec-

retary Condoleezza Rice once said she had "never seen anything warp diplomacy like high oil prices." And affording a tank of gasoline remains a struggle for many families.

Another challenge is failing to keep up with energy research and development, which is one of the major points I want to make today—failing to keep up with energy R&D. That energy research has given us abundant, reliable, clean, cheap energy from unconventional gas to nuclear power. The amount we spend on energy research and development—nearly \$5 billion a year at the Department of Energy in nondefense and noncleanup research; or nearly \$9 billion if you count other agencies and their energy-related research, such as the National Science Foundation, the Department of the Interior, and the National Institute of Standards and Technology—still, those dollars are lower as a percentage of our gross product than major competitors such as France or Japan or Korea or China.

Another challenge is that while the United States has made more gains in reducing the use of carbon than any other industrial country, the National Academies of the United States and 12 other countries have warned that human activity has contributed significantly to climate change and global warming.

So thinking about the progress we have made from 5 years ago and taking into account the challenges we still have, let me suggest four grand principles that could guide our energy future. First, cheaper, not more expensive energy. Five years ago all the talk was about a cap-and-trade program for the United States and deliberately raising the price of energy as a way of achieving clean energy independence.

Last year I was in Germany, a country that adopted exactly that policy. In addition, Germany is closing its nuclear powerplants and becoming more dependent on natural gas but buying both forms of energy from other countries rather than producing it on its own. The Germans are subsidizing wind and solar but are building new coal plants in order to have enough reliable electricity.

In short, what I found in Germany was an energy policy mess that discourages job growth. The end result is that Germany has the second highest household electricity prices in the European Union. When I asked an Economic Minister what he would say to a manufacturer about energy costs in Germany, he said: I would suggest he go somewhere else. Well, that somewhere else is turning out to be the United States: Virginia, Tennessee, other States.

In the United States, we pursued a different track, the most conspicuous example of which is finding unconventional gas and oil. This has created for our country a remarkable phenomenon, a large amount of cheap, clean energy with our own domestic price for natural gas.

This has been the result of a peculiar combination of factors that, in my opinion, amount to a better energy policy than most people give us credit for. The first element is the entrepreneurial spirit of America and the large amount of private property ownership and our huge private market. Another is access to capital. A third and indispensable element is government-sponsored research.

Take our Nation's natural gas boom as an example. In the past it was uneconomical to develop so-called unconventional gas. Government-sponsored research enabled it and demonstrated how it could be done. A temporary Federal tax credit that expired for new shale projects at the end of 1992 encouraged new sources of private capital. Natural gas will be a big part of where we get our clean energy, which leads me to my second principle: clean, not just renewable, energy. Too often we define our energy goals in terms of renewable energy when we should mean clean energy. There are a number of States that have renewable energy mandates defined mainly to include wind and solar power. The Congress is regularly asked to pass a narrowly defined renewable energy mandate for the same purpose.

It is true these energy sources emit no air pollution. These mandates say a certain amount of electricity generated within a State must come from these specific sources. But focusing on this narrow definition for clean energy misses the point, and at a high cost to our electric bills.

Such narrow definitions also discount hydropower and nuclear power, some of our country's cheapest and most available sources of air pollution-free electricity. In the Tennessee Valley Authority region where I live, for example, more than 95 percent of our pollution-free electricity comes from TVA's dams and three nuclear plants, which include six reactors.

Second, mandating renewable energy runs the risk of creating too much reliance on sources that generate power only intermittently. There is certainly a place for these renewable technologies, and solar power especially seems to me to have great promise. But renewable energy consumes great amounts of space, whether it is solar or wind or biomass.

For example, it would take a row of giant wind turbines all the way from Georgia to Maine on the Appalachian Trail to generate the same amount of electricity that we would get from four nuclear power plants. You would still need the nuclear plants because the wind only blows when it wants to.

Fortunately, we have plenty of rooftops on which to put solar panels. When they become cheap enough and aesthetically pleasing enough, they will probably become an increasingly important supplement to our country's huge appetite for electricity, especially because the Sun shines during the peak-use hours.

Battery technology will help make all forms of renewable energy more useful, which brings me to my next principle: research and development, not government mandates. It is hard to think of an important technological advance in our country that has not involved at least some government-sponsored research, especially in the area of energy.

The most recent example is the development of unconventional gas that was enabled by 3D mapping invented at Sandia National Laboratory in New Mexico and the Department of Energy's large-scale demonstration project.

There is an argument that by imposing government mandates, just as by imposing higher prices, government could force some innovation that could move us toward clean energy independence. But I believe the surer path would be to double the federal funding we spend annually on non-defense and non-cleanup energy research and development and trust the marketplace to produce better results.

In 2005 the "Rising Above the Gathering Storm" report, written by a commission led by former Lockheed Martin CEO Norman Augustine, recommended doubling energy research and development. In 2007 Congress responded by passing the America COMPETES Act with overwhelming bipartisan support. Senator COONS and I are working together to reintroduce the America COMPETES Act for a second reauthorization after its original passage.

One small agency that is the result of the America COMPETES Act is what we call ARPA-E. It is already showing signs of the wisdom of this approach. ARPA-E has helped improve battery technology and worked to produce liquid fuel from microbes, among other accomplishments. Seeing how our free enterprise can capitalize on this brings me to my fourth and last principle: free market, not government picking winners and losers.

We are more likely to have abundant supplies of cheap, clean, reliable energy in the United States if we trust the marketplace. The most appropriate role for government is in research. I believe a second role is limited jump-starting of new technologies; for example, unconventional gas, about which I just spoke, involves government research and a limited tax credit.

The full tax credit for electric cars is capped at 200,000 vehicles per manufacturer. To encourage innovation in nuclear energy, the government provided research and licensing support for small modular reactors, but that is limited to 5 years.

Even for nuclear power plants there is a production tax credit, but it is limited to 6,000 megawatts. On the other hand, President Reagan used to say the nearest thing to eternal life we will ever see on this Earth is a government program. That is too often the case with energy subsidies. The most glaring example of that is the more than 20-year-old subsidy for wind power, a

technology that former Energy Secretary Chu said was a technology that had "matured."

This was supposed to help jump-start wind. But we have already lost \$16 billion in Federal revenue from 2009 through the end of 2012 alone. Congress just added a 1-year extension of the wind production tax credit, costing \$12 billion. Remember, the Department of Energy spends just \$5 billion on energy research.

We are spending \$12 billion in a 1-year extension of the wind tax credit. The wind industry's idea of a phaseout would cost tens of billions more. People talk about Big Oil, but the big, unnecessary subsidy is big wind, and a much better place to spend our money would be energy research.

I have been fascinated with the progress we have made on the seven grand challenges I suggested 5 years ago. Perhaps by focusing on these four grand principles, the ones I have suggested in this speech, we can capitalize on the last 5 years of progress and move toward cheap, clean, reliable energy.

Oak Ridge's evolution since the Manhattan Project days provides a good model. About 70 years ago the astonishing collection of physicists that produced the two atomic bombs also enabled nuclear power, nuclear medicine, and other technological advances.

What can we expect 5 years from now? To get a glimpse of the future we might look at what fits within the guiding principles I have suggested today. For example, small modular reactors and virtual reactors that scientists are developing will revolutionize the safety and effectiveness of our nuclear technology.

Game-changing manufacturing is also on the horizon with 3D printing. ARPA-E, a small agency of the Department of Energy that came from America COMPETES, and other groups are increasing the reliability of our electricity supply.

This United States of America is a remarkable place. With the potential I have described and the principles I have suggested, a competitive energy future is well within our grasp.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORAN. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORAN. I thank the Chair for the recognition.

THE FARM BILL

Mr. MORAN. I just returned from my home State of Kansas to return to the work we are about to do in the Senate. This week away from Washington, DC,

gave me the opportunity to travel all corners of our State. I went from southeast Kansas in Galena to northwest Kansas in Goodland, and almost every night while I was home weather was the topic of conversation.

Certainly, as Kansans who have experienced tornadoes in our own State over the last week and, certainly, over the life of our State, we extend our deepest sympathies and concerns to the people of Oklahoma. It is weather that I wanted to talk about on the Senate floor today in preparation for an amendment I will offer, which is being offered to the farm bill, and continued discussion of that farm bill throughout this week.

As I listened to Kansas farmers, the most prevalent request when it comes to farm policy, to a request for what ought to be in a farm bill is the request by Kansans that the Crop Insurance Program remain solid and viable. We live in a State in which weather is not always a friend to agriculture. Yet agriculture is our most significant creator of economic activity and generator of jobs and economic growth in our State.

We have the pleasure, in fact we are very proud, to feed, clothe, and provide energy to much of the world. At the moment the challenges are great because of the significant effect the drought has had on Kansas and much of the Midwest. That drought has been ongoing for more than 2 years, and it has had a significant impact on agricultural production. It is that point I want to make as we debate the farm bill, the importance of the Crop Insurance Program in response to those difficult times.

Despite the drought, our Nation remains the land of plenty, and Americans continue to enjoy the safest and most abundant food supply in the world. The reason we have so much is because of many factors: Prayers, the work ethic of American farmers and ranchers, the courage to persevere in spite of enormous challenges, and, among those things, finally, is the ability to manage risk.

Farming and ranching is a high-risk occupation. Producers can't manage the one thing that matters most to them, Mother Nature. Mother Nature is the one variable that can't be controlled. Mother Nature brings drought, rain, wind, and hail, the things a producer must face head on each year and each year to follow.

With the inability to control the weather, we must control what we can—the great risks associated with agriculture. This is required for the United States to remain that land of plenty.

The risk management tool of choice is crop insurance. Crop insurance gives producers a safety net so when there is a drought, a flood, a hailstorm, or windstorm, they can pick up the pieces and try again. This is what sets us apart from the rest of the world. We have the ability to manage our risks so

when Mother Nature gives us something bad, our Nation's farmers and ranchers can live to start again.

Crop insurance is a public-private partnership. The government helps the producers cover some of the costs of the policy, and the producer covers the rest. Consumers help the producer, and the producer helps the consumer.

To be clear, producers pay a significant part of the premium out of their own pocket. In 2012 they paid \$4.1 billion to buy insurance to manage their risks. When farmers take out a crop insurance policy, they get a bill, not a check.

Crop insurance has virtually replaced the need for ad hoc disaster measures for crops. During my time in the House of Representatives and now in the Senate, going back to 1989, 42 such pieces of legislation have cost the taxpayer more than \$70 billion. During my time in the House, and now the Senate, many times we have asked for ad hoc disaster assistance, a bill to pass the legislature to provide assistance at the moment. Crop insurance is the tool by which we can avoid those requests. When you manage risks with crop insurance, you save the taxpayers money and give the producers a better program.

Today, as we have scheduled votes, I have an amendment on the Senate floor dealing with a crop called alfalfa. Alfalfa is the Nation's fourth most valuable crop, and it plays a significant role in our daily lives.

Alfalfa is a building block for milk and meat. The hay that is grown in the fields of California, Idaho, South Dakota, Colorado, Oregon, Washington, Texas, Wisconsin, Kansas, and the rest of the 50 States is a driver of the cost of products on grocery store shelves. The Nation's fourth most valuable crop is vitally important.

The reality is producers are faced with risks, and there is no good way to manage them when it comes to this crop, alfalfa. The current Crop Insurance Program, Forage Production APH, is severely inadequate, as demonstrated by the fact that less than 10 percent of the acres are enrolled in the program—compared to corn, soybeans, and wheat, which are all more than 80 percent.

Producers are going back to the bank to borrow operating money and being told not to plant alfalfa because there is no good way to manage the risk. This is very troubling because of the impact that alfalfa has on the economy and our Nation's food supply.

The crop is important, and we need to figure out a way to manage its risks. Producers are being told to grow crops that have a safety net, crops that have some kind of guarantee when weather is bad. My amendment, No. 987, requires the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation to conduct research and development regarding the policy to insure alfalfa and a report describing the results of that study. There are no additional costs to the taxpayer with my amendment.

We need to take a good hard look at alfalfa and recognize its value to the Nation. We need to study and develop something that will work, save taxpayer money, and make certain the land of plenty remains the land of plenty. Alfalfa is a building block of milk and meat. With a risk management tool for alfalfa production, producers will enjoy lower input cost and consumers will enjoy less expensive products on the grocery store shelves.

I know you understand the value of agriculture in Kansas, and I appreciate the opportunity to be on the Senate floor today to describe the value of crop insurance and particularly to highlight the amendment we will vote on later today.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alaska.

ALASKA FLOODING

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. President, I rise today to describe the devastating spring breakup flooding affecting my home State of Alaska. As we just heard about Kansas, weather patterns are affecting long-term droughts in farmlands, while in Alaska it is warm weather that is actually going in the opposite direction.

Over the last several weeks our country has witnessed devastating tornadoes in Oklahoma. Our hearts go out to the families of Moore, Oklahoma City, and many others that have been affected, as they rebuild their lives.

Disasters such as these remind us of the importance of family and community, and it should make us again examine the work being done by FEMA and other agencies to help communities prepare for natural disasters. While it didn't make national news, Alaska's families along the Yukon River are putting their lives back together after record flooding last week.

Thick river ice, high temperatures, and fast melting combined to flood the community of Galena during what we call "breakup" in Alaska. For those who have never witnessed it, breakup on Alaska's biggest and mightiest river is a spectacle almost beyond description. As the ice begins to move, buckle, and crack, you can sometimes hear it from miles away. The trouble is, in the wrong conditions, the moving ice can get caught where the rivers make their natural bends. It piles up into mountains of jumbled ice, creating a natural dam that floods everything behind it, or when it suddenly breaks loose, torrents of raging water and ice rush downstream. This year breakup has, unfortunately, caused some extreme conditions in interior Alaska.

Last week, quickly rising waters from a 30-mile ice jam along the Yukon River had the village of Galena underwater for 3 days. This is an example of what you can see. The woods, the trees are there, but all along there is water burying the buildings.

Galena is a village of fewer than 500 people located in the interior of Alaska. At least 300 of these residents had to be evacuated to keep them from danger. Others moved to buildings on higher ground to keep safe from the rising water.

We are grateful to be able to say no deaths or serious injuries have been reported. It is a miracle when you look at the photos of the damage. As I said, this photo, the aerial photo of Galena, shows the extent of the damage. As mentioned, this was a severe flood. It came on very fast, and we had to try to deal with this very quickly because the power of the Yukon, when it is moving, is fast and furious. These ice jams move fast once they break. It is the worst flooding they have seen in 70 years.

When this happens in very remote communities such as Galena, they don't have communications, river-monitoring technology, and transportation infrastructure to react quickly. Let me remind people that you cannot drive out of this community. You have to fly out of this community. So when the river is breaking, it is all hands on deck for everybody.

We are thankful for the response by the Tanana Chiefs Conference, which safely evacuated many residents. The American Red Cross, the Salvation Army, and many volunteers provided invaluable help. I am proud of the community for coming together to support each other and evacuating the elders and those most in need first. Alaskans are the type of people who are always willing to lend a hand to their neighbor.

This flood hit the community hard. Nearly every structure in Galena and the surrounding 25-mile-wide valley basin was under water. You can see here in this photo how that water moved and flooded out the whole area. The ice jam on the Yukon causing this flooding isn't gone yet. Villages down river from Galena, such as St. Mary's or Holy Cross, remain on alert and are bracing for their possible evacuation.

Once again I remind folks, you cannot drive out of these communities, you have to fly out or take the river. The people who live along the Yukon River respect it as a resource but know that living along the banks can also bring dangerous conditions which we must prepare for.

Although the waters in Galena are subsiding, we know the real work is just beginning. This community must rebuild stronger, more prepared for future disasters. And they must do so within the short summer construction season, an added complication for Alaska. Again, our spring is here now, summer will soon be here, and within 3½ months winter will be back.

As chairman of the Senate Homeland Security Subcommittee on Emergency Management, I take this flooding event very seriously. I have been in touch with local leaders, State disaster response agencies, and FEMA. I will re-

main engaged throughout the cleanup and rebuilding process.

I am working with the State on this emergency, and I will make sure we have all the resources possible as Galena repairs and rebuilds. The emergency response priorities right now are restoring essential services and getting people back in their homes. I am pleased Alaska's Governor Parnell declared a State disaster for Galena last week, and I urge the President to act quickly to declare a Federal disaster to free up vital resources to help our State and its people recover.

Responding to natural disasters in Alaska is very different than in the lower 48. We have very unique challenges. It is important to have some perspective on the size and scope of Alaska. Alaska's land is two-and-a-half times the size of the State of Texas. Our road system is smaller than that of Rhode Island, and 82 percent of Alaskan communities are only accessible by air. Flying from Galena to Fairbanks, or back and forth, is equivalent to flying from Washington, DC, to New York. Actually, it is a little longer. It is an amazing distance when you have to go from place to place.

I remind folks, as you can see the great Yukon, in order to bring supplies and necessities in, it is an hour-long flight from the Fairbanks region. This makes the traditional lower 48 disaster response unrealistic for Alaska. In most communities we don't have the road system to truck in critical supplies. We frequently rely on skilled bush pilots and boat captains to bring relief to communities in need. Our pilots are often forced to land on gravel runways or river sandbars and our barge captains must navigate dangerous waters to access rural villages.

Most residents of the lower 48 couldn't even begin to imagine these experiences. This disaster in Galena is a stark reminder of why we must continue to invest in the aviation and maritime lifelines Alaskans rely on for survival.

Another issue unique to my State is the absence of broadband access in rural areas. When I say that, most people say: What is the big deal? Everyone is hooked up. Not in Alaska. This is something most people would consider critical infrastructure in order to respond to disasters.

Increased broadband deployment throughout rural Alaska would help communities such as Galena by providing vital information, such as telehealth access to help injured residents, up-to-date information on changing weather conditions, better communication between responders and the disaster response center, and information on incident response teams and cleanup strategies.

I might relate a personal example here. When I called the individual in charge of the situation on the ground, we were waiting for another radio call-in—let me repeat that: a radio call-in—to get an update from someone on the

site because the technology doesn't exist at the level necessary to monitor a disaster of this magnitude.

This disaster is a reminder of the inequities that still exist in serving rural America. I will continue to look for ways to work with my Senate colleagues to act to provide rural communities with better broadband access, not only for emergency disasters, such as we are having here, but also for basic communication.

All these factors mean Alaskans must work and respond differently when disasters occur in our State. As our State emergency response chief often tells me, "You can't do 'big city' response in most of Alaska." FEMA rules don't always work for rural Alaska. One key concern is making sure FEMA programs for individual assistance are fully employed and complement State assistance.

I am hopeful that between the Federal, State, local, and tribal governments we can get some much-needed assistance to the residents of Galena who are living through this nightmare. I know how strong the people of Galena are, and we know they will continue to stick together through this trying time. But they couldn't do it without the ongoing support of the National Guard and the Alaska Department of Homeland Security Emergency Management Office. We will all continue to work with them as we help the residents of Galena get back on their feet.

Looking forward, as chairman of the Emergency Management Subcommittee, I will be holding listening sessions in Alaska to discuss preparedness and mitigation solutions to natural disasters. Because it is not just the interior that faces serious threats from natural disasters, we must also consider North Slope communities that are often confronting changes from the warming Arctic. It is important for us to tackle these issues head on, to create public-private partnerships, strong communication lines, and disaster response plans so our communities are protected and our residents are safe.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REMEMBERING FRANK R. LAUTENBERG

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I just flew in from Chicago. Early this morning, I was given the news that I had lost a great friend and one of my dearest colleagues; Senator FRANK LAUTENBERG of New Jersey passed away.

Most of us saw FRANK a few weeks ago. He was here on the floor of the

Senate. He had to come down; it was one of those moments where his vote was crucial. We knew he was struggling, but we also knew he would be here. He said he would, and he was. He sat right over here in a wheelchair, with that trademark FRANK LAUTENBERG smile. I don't think I have ever run into a person in my life as happy as FRANK LAUTENBERG. He was a great joke-teller. The best thing about FRANK's joke—even if he was telling it for the 254th time—is he would start laughing before the end of the joke and pretty soon the whole room was laughing.

You always wanted to be out for dinner with FRANK and Bonnie because you knew there was going to be a good time. You would hear a lot of jokes you had heard before, but you encouraged him to tell them. He had so many stories to tell.

Here he was, a member of the “greatest generation,” having served in World War II, and served here in the Senate. Two different approaches. He retired once and came back, and served here to the age of 89.

He astonished us all when he came here on the floor of the Senate, that he was wheeled in in a wheelchair to vote on some important amendments related to gun safety and gun control. FRANK, if he were alive, would not have missed those votes; it meant so much to him. It was an issue that he led on, he was respected for. When it came to closing the loopholes where convicted felons and people who had no business owning guns were buying them anyway, FRANK LAUTENBERG led the effort to stop the proliferation of guns and the distribution of them to people who would misuse them. It was a cause he felt passionately about, and one he cast many tough votes on as he served in the Senate.

His return that day for those votes was an act of courage in a long life that was filled with courage, starting with his service in the U.S. Army in World War II, and continuing throughout his life—physical courage, political courage, and moral courage.

When FRANK LAUTENBERG spoke to some law students at Rutgers University about 10 years ago, he said he had considered briefly studying law himself after he had served in the Army in World War II but decided he was too old to start law school. He told the law students: It was too late; I missed my opportunity.

FRANK LAUTENBERG may not have earned a law degree, but make no mistake, FRANK LAUTENBERG of New Jersey left an important mark on the laws of America.

Here is how I first came to know him. In 1986, I was a Congressman from Springfield, IL, and had been here 4 years. I had never met FRANK LAUTENBERG of New Jersey, who was a Senator at the time. I got this crazy notion to introduce a bill to ban smoking on airplanes. I didn't have a chance, not a chance. The entire leadership of the

House of Representatives opposed me—all the Democratic leaders of my party and all the Republican leaders too. Yet I put the amendment on a transportation appropriations bill, and through some good luck and breaks it made it through the Rules Committee. That wasn't supposed to happen.

It turned out that when the chairman of the Rules Committee—Claude Pepper of Florida—was a Senator years before, he had been instrumental in starting the National Cancer Institute. As a southerner, he didn't talk much about tobacco—nobody did from the South in those days—but in his heart he knew tobacco smoking was killing people. He let me get that amendment to the floor, which shocked everybody. I remember the day—and this goes back 27 years—I was in the House of Representatives, brand new, calling this amendment to ban smoking on flights of 2 hours or less. That is how we started. I looked up in the gallery, and the gallery was filled with flight attendants in their uniforms from all different airlines. They were victims too of second-hand smoke.

We called that measure for a vote, and it passed. It shocked everybody. It turned out the House of Representatives was the biggest frequent flier club in America. They were sick and tired of sitting on airplanes and breathing in somebody else's secondhand smoke.

Well, there were a few moments of jubilation and celebration. Then somebody said, Well, what are you going to do in the Senate? I thought, Oh, my goodness; that is an important part of this. So I decided to call the chairman of the Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee—a fellow named FRANK LAUTENBERG of New Jersey. I didn't know him, but I said to him, FRANK, I would like to ask you a favor. Would you consider offering this bill as an amendment to the Senate transportation appropriations bill. He said, I will get back to you. And he did—in a hurry. He said, I am on board. Let's do it together.

It was the best phone call I ever made. And for the people of this country and those who fly on airplanes, that team of LAUTENBERG and DURBIN managed to pass a bill, signed into law, which did much more than we ever dreamed of. We thought this little idea of taking smoking off airplanes would make flight a little more comfortable and safer from a health point of view. What neither FRANK nor I realized at the time was it was a tipping point. Americans looked around and said, If we are going to take smoking off airplanes, why stop there? Trains, buses, offices, hospitals, restaurants—look across the board at what has happened in America. Neither FRANK nor I saw this coming, but it worked. It has changed this country. It has changed the Senate, the House—it has changed this country. I wouldn't be standing here today telling you the story were it not for FRANK LAUTENBERG. He was the very best partner I ever could have

had. The day came when I was elected to the Senate. He and I used to go around and tell the story from time to time, reminiscing about that battle back in 1986.

FRANK told us he was once a two-pack-a-day cigarette smoker himself, but when it came to this bill, he knew the right thing to do. I was lucky to have him by my side. I couldn't have done it without him.

He was the driving force behind a lot of other laws that were important to America: setting the national drinking age at 21; setting the national blood level definition of 0.08 for drunk driving. These laws on smoking and drunk driving have saved millions of lives thanks to the leadership of FRANK LAUTENBERG.

He was the last remaining World War II veteran in the Senate. A few weeks ago we lost Danny Inouye, who used to sit right here. He, of course, served in World War II as well.

FRANK passed away early this morning in New York. He is survived by his wife Bonnie Englehardt Lautenberg. What an extraordinarily good person she is. I left a message for her on her voicemail and said, Standing by FRANK's side made a big difference in his life, in the years they were together. They were a great partnership. In addition, he is survived by 6 children and 13 grandchildren.

He was a leader on environmental protection, transportation, and protecting public health. He authored the law that prevented domestic abusers from possessing guns. It wasn't easy to do. It looks pretty obvious, doesn't it? It turned out police organizations were opposing him, because some policemen had been accused of domestic abuse and they couldn't carry a gun under the Lautenberg amendment. FRANK stood his ground.

He cowrote the new GI bill for the 21st century. A man who was a beneficiary of the original GI bill in World War II teamed up with Jim Webb of the State of Virginia, and the two of them put together a GI bill that our men and women who serve richly deserve.

He authored the toxic right to know law. It was another great law he and I cosponsored. It came down to the question of the chemicals that are put in fabric in our furniture—which, sadly, leach out and get into the environment of our homes, many times affecting small children. FRANK was quick to be the leader on that issue. Even though his State of New Jersey is one with a lot of chemical manufacturers and producers, he led in this effort to protect families and children.

He wrote the law to create the Paterson Great Falls National Historic Park. After he cast his 9,000th vote in December of 2011, Senator HARRY REID proclaimed on the Senate floor, “FRANK LAUTENBERG has been one of the most productive Senators in the history of this country.”

It was February 15 that FRANK announced he wasn't going to seek another term in the Senate. At the time

of his announcement in his hometown of Paterson, he set out an agenda for the remaining 2 years of what he wanted to get done before he left the Senate: reforming the U.S. chemical safety laws, improving gun safety, and providing Federal resources for New Jersey to rebuild from Superstorm Sandy.

We owe it to FRANK and his memory to make sure those things are done. I know that BOB MENENDEZ, his friend and close colleague from New Jersey, will pick up that gauntlet and proceed to carry on in FRANK's name.

He used to say with some pride that he was a success in business—and he was—and that he understood the mind of businessmen. But he never ever lost touch with the common man and the people who counted on him in New Jersey and around the United States.

The Senate is going to miss FRANK LAUTENBERG. I am going to miss a great pal. I am going to miss one of the best dinner companions you could ever dream of here in Washington, DC. We are going to join together on Wednesday up in New York for a memorial service. I am sure it is going to be widely attended, because FRANK did a lot of good for a lot of people over the course of his years in public service. I am going to miss him.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I was going to speak on a different subject, but I will speak further about our dear colleague Senator LAUTENBERG. I look at the flowers on his desk—it seems in the years I have been here I have seen too many colleagues' flowers there. Of course, every day FRANK LAUTENBERG was here, I had the privilege of serving with him, a dear friend. I missed him when he left the Senate and was overjoyed when he came back to the Senate. He was a man who cared about his country, cared about the Senate, cared about the people.

He was a man who came from humble beginnings and became extremely wealthy. He spent a lot of time giving that wealth away. He was the last combat veteran—in fact, the last veteran from World War II serving in this body. Those of us who got to know him and spent time hearing of those horrendous times in Europe during World War II are better for it. We realized a person who had served the country during that time did more than any of the rest of us.

I will speak further about my friend FRANK LAUTENBERG. I know Marcelle and I extend our love to Bonnie and his children, his family.

I ask consent to speak as in morning business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATIONS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, before the Senate went into recess, I was disappointed with the statements made to the Senate that misstated the history of Judge Srinivasan's confirmation process. The Senator who said the chairman of the Judiciary Committee made "no effort, no effort" to have a hearing on Judge Srinivasan until late last year was misinformed, and in stating what he did, he misinformed the Senate.

We made efforts in the fall before the election to schedule such a hearing, and I renewed our push to have a hearing on the nomination before the end of the session. I was accommodating Republican objections by not scheduling a hearing before the end of last year.

These erroneous RECORD statements—these erroneous statements to the rest of the Senate—have me wondering whether I should be so accommodating to Republican scheduling demands if they then forget their demands in their efforts to avoid responsibility and to blame others. In other words, they request a delay and then say, well, of course it is somebody else's fault that we had the delay.

Judge Srinivasan was nominated June 11, 2012, during a summer when Senate Republicans were in the process of constricting the confirmation process and intent on their misapplication of the so-called Thurmond rule to stall judicial nominees before the Presidential election. It was only in May, 2012, that the Senate completed action on the 19 nominees held over on the Senate Executive Calendar in 2011. Republicans were in the process of filibustering a nominee to the Ninth Circuit from Arizona. Interestingly enough, the person they were filibustering had been recommended by Jon Kyl of Arizona, the deputy Republican leader, of course a Republican Senator. Republicans were dragging out confirmations of judicial nominees who had been nominated in the fall of 2011 and the early months of 2012. They even filibustered a Tenth Circuit nominee from Oklahoma who had been supported by the two Republican Senators from Oklahoma in what was the first filibuster of a circuit court nominee reported with bipartisan support by the Judiciary Committee. Throw out all the precedents, throw out all the rule books, throw out everything Democrats and Republicans have done in the past—it is going to be our way or the highway. Even when the President of the United States, in trying to reach out, nominates a judge supported by the two Republican Senators of that State, a judge reported out by a bipartisan vote by the Senate Judiciary Committee, they say: Oh, what the heck, President Obama nominated him, let's filibuster him. This is wrong. It is

a pity. It is beneath the United States Senate.

They filibustered a First Circuit nominee from Maine who was supported by the two Republican Senators from Maine. In addition, Republicans had filibustered the earlier nomination of Caitlin Halligan to the DC Circuit. Anybody who needs to refresh their recollections of those months should reread my statements on judicial nominations from June 6, June 11, June 12, June 18, June 26, July 10, July 16, July 23, July 30, August 2, September 10, September 20, November 30, December 3, December 6, December 11, December 13, and December 17. Unlike the recent misstatements made to the Senate, the facts are in those statements of mine.

By July 19, 2012, I had determined that the paperwork on the Srinivasan nomination was complete and the nominee could be included in a hearing. It has been my practice as chairman of the Judiciary Committee, in an effort to be fair, to do something that was not always done by others, to give the minority notice and allow consultation before scheduling a nomination for a hearing. At that time, the next July hearing had been discussed as one devoted to the nominee to head the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice, a nomination that itself had been delayed and to which there was Republican opposition. During the August recess, my staff asked Senator GRASSLEY's about holding a hearing on the Srinivasan nomination in September. They raised objections and concerns about proceeding with the DC Circuit nomination at that time but agreed to proceed with four district nominees and a Court of International Trade nominee.

In November 2012, after the American people had solidly reelected President Obama, we raised the need for the hearing on the DC Circuit nomination anew. Republicans objected, again, in spite of the precedent of holding a hearing on one of President Bush's DC Circuit nominees during a similar lameduck session.

Instead, they said: No, no, no. It is all right to do it for a Republican President but not for this Democratic President, Barack Obama. We can't do it for him. I know you allowed it for President George W. Bush, but after all, he is different. He was a Republican President. We cannot do it for this Democratic President. Instead they wanted to proceed only with district court nominees during the lameduck. Republicans insisted the Srinivasan hearing be put off until the next Congress and the new year. In deference to the Republican minority, I held off. They agreed that he would be included in the first nominations hearing of the 113th Congress.

Then, in early January this year, when called upon to hold up what they said they would agree to, their end of the bargain, Republicans wanted to change the rules again and they

balked. They insisted the nominee and others be interviewed and scores of documents be produced in their effort to stall other nominations. In other words, having made an agreement, they backed out of it. The nominee was not, and could not have been, the “lawyer . . . who handled” the *Magner* case. In fact, the United States was not a party in the *Magner* case. As was readily apparent from the one email that named Srinivasan, his alleged “involvement” was merely being asked by Tom Perez, now the President’s nominee to be Labor Secretary, a technical legal question about U.S. Supreme Court procedure. It was the nominee’s job as the Principal Deputy Solicitor General to answer such questions for administration officials—and he did answer it appropriately. Republicans could have asked him about it at his confirmation hearing in January and fulfilled their agreement, but they insisted on using his nomination as leverage against the administration. They insisted, instead, on first interviewing three U.S. Department of Justice officials, including Tom Perez, before they would go forward with his hearing.

After months of attempts to get the committee Republicans to focus on the nominee at hand while they insisted on their wide-ranging investigation of Tom Perez, a nominee not pending before the Judiciary Committee, Republicans finally agreed to include Srinivasan at the Judiciary Committee on April 10, 2013. That was more than 7 months after the hearing I had first been proposed and more than three months after the hearing to which they had previously agreed.

As I noted in my December 12 hearing statement, as Chairman I had not jammed the minority with judicial confirmation hearings the way my Republican predecessor did. I was trying to bring the Senate back to the way it should be, the same way I did during the immigration hearings and markup. I did not want to go back to the games played that we had to face when they were in charge. I think no good deed goes unpunished.

We held only 11 judicial nomination hearings in 2012. In light of the Senate’s recess schedule for the election cycle, we held only two after the August recess. The nominations included at those hearings were the result of consultation with the ranking minority member and were essentially by agreement.

I now see that when we try to work it out, and we keep our word and we have conciliation and accommodation and keep our word and our part of the bargain, all we get is recrimination from the other side as they try to break the bargain. That is not the Senate I have been proud to serve in for 38 years.

This nominee was praised at the hearing and proceeded to answer scores of written questions after the hearing. When he had provided his written re-

sponses, I listed his nomination for action by the Judiciary Committee on May 9, 2013. In what has become standard practice for the Republicans on the Judiciary Committee, they still insisted on holding him over for another week for no good reason. I protected their right on that, even though it has been abused in a way I have never seen in 38 years.

Presaging the unanimous Senate vote, the vote in the Judiciary Committee was 18 to zero when it was finally allowed to proceed on May 16. Republicans then insisted that the Senate vote on his confirmation be delayed two weeks until after the Memorial Day recess. I would not be surprised if Senate Republicans now took credit for expediting that vote despite the fact that it took the Majority Leader filing a cloture petition to get that vote in May.

I make significant efforts to ensure that the minority is prepared to move forward on a nomination before we schedule a hearing. My staff routinely gives them our plan weeks in advance. Even with this advance notice, I routinely have to notice a hearing without listing nominees because the minority has not yet taken the time to read the basic material on the nominations despite its being available for weeks, and sometimes months, with something a law clerk could have done in 20 minutes, but this highly paid professional staff can’t get around to doing it.

I am disappointed that despite the fact that I have bent over backwards to accommodate them, Senate Republicans contend that I made “no effort, no effort” to hold Judge Srinivasan’s hearing last fall. One Republican Senator said during the debate on the Srinivasan nomination that the delay must have been my choice since that decision was “solely within the control of the Democratic majority.” For Senate Republicans to pretend that they had no role in delaying this nomination was wrong. Do they really think the American people are that gullible? I think not.

We had the Policeman of the Year award early this morning in the Mansfield Room. When I looked up at that painting of Mike Mansfield, I thought of how wonderful it was to come here when he was the majority leader. I remember him saying one thing: Senators, no matter what their party, should always keep their word; and when on the floor of the Senate, they should always tell the truth. That is good advice. I wish people would start following it.

COMMENDING SENATOR STABENOW

I see the distinguished Senator from Michigan, the chair of the Senate Agriculture Committee, on the floor. If I could take 30 seconds longer so I can say with her here what I said about her in Vermont to a group of farmers this past week: The Senate is blessed to have her as chair. Nobody has done it better, and I can speak with some experience. She brought through a wonder-

ful bipartisan farm bill last year. The other body did not take it up. She is going to bring through a wonderful one this year. I hope they will take it up.

While she is on the Senate floor, I want to say the same thing I said about her in the State of Vermont: Every one of us is so proud of the Senator. Whether it was a Republican or Democrat, they all agreed.

I yield the floor.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

AGRICULTURE REFORM, FOOD, AND JOBS ACT OF 2013

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 954, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 954) to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018.

Pending:

Stabenow (for Leahy) amendment No. 998, to establish a pilot program for gigabit Internet projects in rural areas.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, before the distinguished chair of the Judiciary Committee—and former chair of the Agriculture Committee—leaves the floor, I just want to thank him not only for being a wonderful role model for me in chairing the Agriculture Committee, but also for the way in which he conducts the Judiciary Committee. He is evenhanded, fair, and gives every member the opportunity to make their case, whether it is legislation coming through on gun violence, immigration, or judicial nominations. I just want to thank the Senator for being the model of a statesman in all he does.

I agree that we need to move forward in a fair and open bipartisan way in filling the nominations of our judiciary. I just wanted to thank the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. President, we are resuming the consideration of the farm bill, the agriculture reform, food, and jobs bill. Before I address that, I want to take a moment—as many colleagues have already done, and many more will do—to pay a very special tribute to a dear friend and colleague, Senator FRANK LAUTENBERG of New Jersey.

REMEMBERING FRANK R. LAUTENBERG

I was deeply saddened, as we all were today, to learn Senator LAUTENBERG had passed away during the night. My thoughts and prayers are with Bonnie and the whole family, as I know they are grieving because of the special loss they feel and we will all feel.

He was the kind of Senator we will not see again—a World War II veteran. We have lost our World War II veterans. He defended freedom against

some of the most evil forces of the 20th century, and he was truly a member of the “greatest generation” of Americans.

We saw him battle cancer and survive. We have seen him come to the floor time after time on behalf of the people of New Jersey and our country to fight with tremendous courage for what he believed was right.

I daresay he was one of the lions of the Senate. He served for nearly 30 years, casting over 9,000 votes on behalf of the State and the people he loved.

What makes Congress special is that we all come from all walks of life, and as we know that is what makes a great democracy. That is what gives us our strength, not weakness.

Senator LAUTENBERG was the son of Jewish immigrants. He went to school on the GI bill—as my dad did—after defending our country. He went on to become a successful businessman by developing one of the most successful payroll companies in the world.

We were proud to have Senator LAUTENBERG speak on what it meant to be a success in creating jobs. He has been a wonderful voice in that regard.

He found his true calling in public service, and we all know that. During his five terms in the Senate he was one of the most fearless fighters on a whole range of issues. He has made a permanent mark on the quality of life of Americans. Among other things, he helped to strengthen drunk driving laws, pass the ban on smoking, prevent those convicted of domestic violence from possessing guns, to author legislation to help the public discover what pollutants were being released into neighborhoods, and to cowrite the new GI bill for the 21st century. I could go on and on with so many other examples.

I am proud to have worked with him to champion cleaning our beaches all along our coasts and Great Lakes, working to increase the awareness and treatment of autism, and fighting to make sure women have access to the health care we need and deserve.

He was a true fighter for the rights of all Americans, and he will be greatly missed.

Once again, I send my thoughts and prayers to his wife Bonnie, who is an amazing woman in her own right, his children, and his grandchildren during this very difficult time.

Mr. President, as we return to the debate on the farm bill today, it is important to note that what we do this week will reflect just how committed we are to 16 million Americans who depend on agriculture for their livelihood. All Americans depend on its success for the safest, most affordable, and abundant food supply in the world.

We have to lead by example. We cannot kick the can down the road. We, in the Senate, have already worked hard together on this farm bill which passed out of the Agriculture Committee with broad bipartisan support. We have had a good debate on the Senate floor and

a number of votes. We are close to finishing the bill, and we need to get it done this week.

I will note that it was just a year ago when we were also working on this bill. At that time, after coming out of committee on a strong bipartisan vote as well, we had 73 record rollcall votes. Every one of the substantive amendments that passed on the floor is already in this bill.

So we started with the work we did a year ago and the amendments of colleagues that were passed on the floor of the Senate, and now we are building on that with additional ideas. We know it is time to bring this work to a close and get it done.

We need to move forward in order to take care of the people who rely on agricultural policy, conservation policy, nutrition, energy policy, and rural development. Every community outside of our major cities depends on rural development funds in order to be able to provide economic development, build the water and sewer project, build the road, and provide a loan for a small business. They are all counting on us to get this bill done so they have some long-term certainty.

This is a jobs bill, and the 5-year bill in front of us needs to get passed so they have certainty about how to plan for the future and how to continue to create jobs.

We also need to pass this bill because we need to stop unnecessary spending, and we do that in this bill. We need to also ensure that consumers will continue to have a safe, healthy, and affordable food supply. We need to come together to show that, once again, we can work together across party lines as we have done on this legislation. It is important to get this bill done this week.

I am very proud of the fact that last year we were the only committee that produced a voluntary deficit reduction plan. We went through every single page of the policy under the farm bill, and I asked: Does it duplicate something else? Does it work? Is it needed anymore? Is it worthy of taxpayer dollars?

At the end we had eliminated 100 different programs or authorizations. Some programs were consolidated or strengthened, such as conservation. Others were eliminated because they did not make sense. Things such as direct payment subsidies did not make sense. Last year we were able to produce \$23 billion in savings.

This year we were back at it again and looked at a couple of other ideas, and it is \$24 billion in savings to reduce the deficit. To put that in some kind of context, under the across-the-board cuts we have all known to be called the sequester—the across-the-board cuts over the next 10 years for every agency—agriculture’s across-the-board cut is \$6 billion.

We could have said: Well, the sequester is \$6 billion, so we will find \$6 billion in savings. We didn’t do that. We

found four times as much in savings. We wanted to come to the floor of the Senate to tell every colleague that there is integrity in every program; that we have done everything we could to cut duplication, create accountability, and provide policies that make sense for the American taxpayer.

We don’t do subsidies anymore, we do insurance. We partnered with farmers to buy insurance so they have skin in the game. They don’t receive a check, they get a bill for the insurance. But just like any other insurance, there is no payout unless there is a loss. So that is the basic structure.

We have done a tremendous amount to also hone in on areas of, frankly, misuse or abuse in policy as it relates to the commodity title as well. For instance, this bill caps payments in the commodity program to half of what they currently are. So we cut in half the current limit on what may be received by an individual farmer.

Senator GRASSLEY and Senator TIM JOHNSON deserve tremendous credit. Senator GRASSLEY, as a member of our committee, has championed these reforms in payments for years, and this is the first farm bill that has that in the base bill. We are cutting the payments in half.

We closed something called the manager’s loophole to ensure that so-called farm managers actually have to be farming. They have to actually be farming to get a farm payment.

Today the Washington Post has an article that I would encourage folks to read. It talks about folks who are in Manhattan and Georgetown, living in multimillion-dollar homes, receiving these payments, and they are not farmers. Because of the current structure and lack of accountability and focus, they are actually getting paid. They do not get that anymore under this bill. We have important reforms.

This bill saves money by tightening rules to prevent fraud and misuse in our nutrition programs. Our nutrition programs are critical and essential. Just as crop insurance is there when a farmer has a disaster, food programs are there when a family has a disaster.

We know, as in anything else, there are areas where there can be abuse or waste. In my own home State, much to my chagrin, we have seen lottery winners continue to receive food assistance. We stop that. We crack down on retailers engaged in trafficking of benefits, and we prevent States from allowing some individuals to claim expenses they don’t really have in order to increase their benefits.

By ending the misuse but making sure we keep the standard benefit for every man, woman, and child who deserves some temporary help, we are putting more integrity into the food program. I would argue we need to make sure we stand strong against the cuts coming from the House of Representatives when we talk about food assistance for folks who have paid taxes all of their lives, who never

thought in their wildest dreams they would ever need help, who are mortified and who suddenly find themselves out of work and need to know somebody will be there to help them put food on the table, help them get back on their feet. Our bill does that while creating accountability. I am very proud of the work our committee has done.

We also have streamlined programs not only to save dollars but to create more flexibility.

We have done a tremendous amount of work in the area of conservation. We have over 650 conservation and environmental groups across the country endorsing our work in conservation. We took 23 conservation programs and cut them down to 14 and then put them in 4 very different and flexible areas. These conservation groups see that as an improvement because we are cutting down the paperwork and making it more flexible for farmers and community groups to be able to access conservation programs, and we are actually saving money as we are doing that.

In this bill, as the Presiding Officer knows, we have also codified a very important agreement that environmentalists, conservation groups, and farm commodity group leaders have come to in supporting crop insurance and making sure those who receive crop insurance are compliant with conservation. It is a very important policy, and I commend everybody who worked so hard on it.

Once again, as we go into this week, I wish to remind colleagues this is a jobs bill. Agriculture is a bright spot in our economy. It is the only area in which we actually have a trade surplus. The farm bill invests in a number of areas to boost exports and to help family farmers sell more goods locally. We make some changes. While we are cutting in certain areas, we actually increase in others. That is what we ought to do when we make good policy decisions. So we have increased funding for farmers markets, local food hubs, the ability for schools to be able to purchase more fresh foods and vegetables locally—things that create jobs locally.

We have spurred innovations in new biobased manufacturing—not just bioenergy, but we can replace chemicals and petroleum with things such as soybean oil and other agricultural byproducts that are actually cleaner, biodegradable, create jobs, and get us off foreign oil. So there are new initiatives in the farm bill that allow us to do that as well.

It really is a time for reform of the policies that fall under what we dub the “farm bill.” This bill, I believe and I think it is safe to say, is the most reform we have seen in decades. We have done it on a bipartisan basis. We have had tough votes and made tough decisions, but I believe they are the right decisions in terms of reform. This is a bipartisan effort, coming out of committee 15 to 5, and I hope for and ex-

pect a strong bipartisan vote as we had a year ago.

This really is a jobs bill. It really is a jobs bill, and in order to keep it a set of jobs policies, our farmers and ranchers need to have the economic certainty of getting this work done and having a 5-year policy that will allow them to plan and to continue to create the safest, most affordable food supply for Americans of anyone in the world. So it is time to get it done. We are anxious to work with colleagues this week to do that.

Thank you, Mr. President. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. INHOFE. I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for such time as I may consume.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SEXUAL ASSAULT

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, tomorrow the Senate Armed Services Committee is going to hold a hearing on the pending legislation regarding sexual assault in the military.

Lately, we have been bombarded, we have been inundated with news reports about sexual assault in the military in our Nation. We can't lose sight of the fact that we have the finest military in the world. The presence of sexual predators in our force does not take away from the overwhelming good that is done around the world by our members in uniform, but the presence of these sexual predators in the ranks needs to be addressed, and that is what the military is doing now with or without our interference.

Last year's NDAA—the National Defense Authorization Act—signed into law in January of this year, included 10 new provisions dealing with sexual assault that commanders have barely had time to begin implementing, let alone to assess the effectiveness of them. Yet some want to provide still more changes in the law this year. These commanders need time to act. We can't keep piling new demands on our commanders until they have had time to meet the previous demands. That is what the hearing tomorrow is really all about. We are going to be talking about more demands along these lines.

Today, sexual assault has not been eliminated, but we are working on it. The battle is not lost. More needs to be done. We understand that, and more is going to be done. But we have to preserve the leadership tools that make our forces the finest in the world. One such tool has been to give commanders

authority to identify and correct problems firmly and fairly and dispose of disciplinary offenses that destroy morale and readiness. That is why I oppose the proposals to eliminate the role of the commander in this process.

To take the commander out of the process would invite failure. These commanders have to make decisions to send our brave troops into battle. How ludicrous is it that we would say to our commanders: You have to make a decision to send one of our kids into battle where they may end up losing their lives; however, you can't participate in the justice system of the troops. It doesn't make any sense at all.

As we consider the many proposals to combat sexual assault in the military, we can't lose sight of the importance to do three things. The three things are protect, prevent, and preserve. We have to protect the critical role of the commander in driving cultural changes and accountability. We have to prevent case disposition authority from being transferred outside the chain of command. Those of us who have been in the service know what that is. Thirdly, we have to preserve the integrity of the Uniform Code of Military Justice as an integrated, functional system of justice.

First, we have to protect the critical role of the commander. The military is a hierarchy. The most junior recruit quickly learns there is always someone above him in the military organization. I have been there. I understand that. The need to follow the chain of command has been instilled in our troops. That is what they do. It is not a social system; this is a chain of command. Our military is both an organization of leaders and of followers who are in training to become leaders. In peacetime or in war, leaders establish clear expectations and insist on meeting objectives. Every job in the military is important, and every job needs to be done correctly because lives depend on it. The security of our Nation also depends on it. To ensure that the tough jobs get done, the military has a justice system that sets the expectation that decisions have consequences and, I might add, bad decisions have consequences also.

Today there are four major bills that have been introduced to address perceived deficiencies in how the armed services address sexual assault. I think these will very likely be discussed—maybe not all four of them, but some of them are going to be discussed in tomorrow's hearing. I believe that before we make significant, substantive, and procedural changes to the law, including the UCMJ, we need the benefit of adequate review. We need to think before we act.

We have to prevent case disposition authority from being transferred outside the chain of command. It is a terrible idea to remove the authority of commanders to dispose of the military justice offenses. If commanders will be held responsible for abolishing sexual

assault, then they must have the tools they need.

Some propose establishing colonel-level JAGs—judge advocate generals—instead of commanders as disposition authorities who would decide what cases should go to courts-martial. The awesome authority of a commander is the foundation for discipline within the organization. The most junior service-member in the organization knows, under the current law, their commander has the ability to decide if misconduct should be disposed of through administrative measures, by non-judicial punishment, or by a court-martial. Others within the command watch how the commander deals with misconduct. All of this stuff doesn't happen in a vacuum. People are watching. Those individuals who are going to be under the control and command and jurisdiction of a commander have to know how they are doing it. If the commander is not allowed to exercise that authority, it will destroy discipline within the command. When discipline declines, the military's ability to deflect threats declines with it.

Another proposal would create two separate disciplinary systems: one in which commanders retain limited ability to dispose of minor, uniquely military offenses; another where a judge advocate, far removed from the commander, decides what offenses go to trial by court-martial. Now, how can two systems possibly be more efficient and effective than one system in the hands of commanders who are fully vested in the wellness and the readiness of their commands?

Another proposal would revoke designation of certain senior officers who are currently authorized by Federal law to convene general courts-martial. This has broad implications beyond military justice. This would require the services to revise literally hundreds of service regulations.

Another proposal that I think is worthy of careful review would establish a special victims counsel. The proposal would assign an attorney to the victim of sexual assault to provide advice throughout the process, from initial complaint of sexual assault through final disposition. The Air Force has already developed a pilot program. We are doing it now. So I think the suggestion is good, but it is simply what we are currently doing. Wouldn't it be better to wait and get the results of what the Air Force is doing in their program to determine whether this is something we want to continue?

I am willing to consider appropriate changes to the UCMJ in a thoughtful bipartisan approach that is consistent with the longstanding traditions of the Senate Committee on Armed Services. In the fiscal year 2013 NDAA—the National Defense Authorization Act—we created an independent panel to review the UCMJ and judicial proceedings of sexual assault cases. The panel is tasked with assessing the response systems used to investigate, prosecute,

and adjudicate sexual assault and related offenses and to recommend how to improve effectiveness. The commission has only just begun, and we must allow it the opportunity to do what it was created to do. So we established this. It was just last January when we established this, and they are busy doing what we have asked them to do.

Sexual assault cannot be abolished by legislation alone. While we should not wait to provide additional tools that could make a difference immediately, we have to be deliberate in making fundamental changes that could undermine the UCMJ. I said we should do three things, and this is the third thing.

The third thing is to preserve the integrity of the UCMJ as an integrated, functional system of justice. Since 1951, the UCMJ has backed up commanders' authority and their best leadership skills with the force of law. The UCMJ is a deployable justice system that has proved to be effective throughout our Nation's conflicts.

Some believe military justice under the UCMJ and the Manual for Courts-Martial is an informal, undisciplined system. Nothing could be further from the truth. The UCMJ is a highly developed and codified legal system. The Rules of Court Martial are the military counterpart to the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure and provide detailed and structured procedural rules. The Military Rules of Evidence are based on the Federal Rules of Evidence.

The UCMJ has been at the forefront of changes in the civil criminal justice system. In fact, it has been ahead of the civil system. They are doing things in advance of what the civil system actually does.

A rights warning statement similar to the now-familiar Miranda warnings was required by article 31 of the UCMJ a decade and a half before the Supreme Court decision of *Miranda v. Arizona*. The UCMJ was offering these protections long before the civil courts did—the same thing with article 38(b). It continued the 1948 Articles of War guarantee of qualified defense counsel—in other words, you get a defense counsel—to be provided to all accused and at earlier stages than required in civilian jurisdictions. So the military was providing counsel long before the civil system was. Yet the U.S. Supreme Court only guaranteed counsel to the poorest criminal defendants in 1963. Again, UCMJ was way ahead of the game.

Our Nation has 238 years of investment in our military justice system, a system of Federal law, rules of procedure and evidence, and case history interpreting those rules that form the foundation for one of the most comprehensive and sophisticated justice systems the world has ever known.

The UCMJ is not static and unchanging. It has continuously been updated. Article 146 of the UCMJ requires an annual comprehensive update. The Joint Service Committee reviews rec-

ommendations to modify the UCMJ on a regular basis.

Some remain committed to yet another round of changes to the law and, in fact, the recently passed fiscal year 2013 NDAA included some 10 legislative changes addressing sexual assault in the military.

The services need adequate time to implement recent legal changes that give them the tools to fight these assaults. Stop and think about it. Just last January we gave 10 new rules for them to absorb and put into play. They have not had time to do that yet. Yet we are talking about having a meeting and putting together something that would be maybe even contradicting what we have already told them to do.

Some would criticize our commanders and the entire military justice system because of a recent case in which a court-martial conviction was set aside. If we take time to look at the statistics, we will see commanders have only set aside findings of guilty in about 1 percent of the cases.

The Marine commanders only set aside findings in 7 out of 1,768 cases from 2010 to 2012. That is 0.4 percent of the cases—less than 1 percent.

The Air Force commanders only set aside findings in 40 of 3,713 cases over 5 years. That is 1 percent.

The Army commanders set aside findings in only 68 of 4,603 cases since 2008.

The Navy says its commanders only set aside findings in 4 of the 16,056 cases they have tried from 2002 to 2012. That is 0.0001 percent in a 10-year period.

Clearly, the commanders have been doing a good job. The Defense Legal Policy Board released a subcommittee report on military justice in combat zones just last week. This Defense Legal Policy Board was put together and they have experts to study this matter. We all agreed this was a good move. They came out with their report last week. This is not something that might have happened 2 or 3 years ago. It happened just last week.

The subcommittee began its work on July 30, 2012, to assess the application of military justice in combat zones in Afghanistan and Iraq. This report states, since the beginning of 2001, the Army conducted over 800 courts-martial in deployed environments, the Navy and Marine Corps conducted 8 courts-martial in Afghanistan and 34 in Iraq, and the Air Force conducted 3 courts-martial in Iraq and 3 in Afghanistan.

The main theme of the Defense Legal Policy Board's subcommittee hearings and their 208-page report is the need for the joint commander to have a central role in the administration of justice in deployed theaters of operations. This is the opposite of what some people are saying now. They are saying take the commander out of it.

I am going to read this quote. This report came out just 1 week ago.

While good order and discipline is important and essential in any military environment, it is especially vital in the deployed

environment. The military justice system is the definitive commanders' tool to preserve good order and discipline, and nowhere—I repeat—nowhere is this more important than in a combat zone. A breakdown of good order and discipline while deployed can have a devastating effect on mission effectiveness.

Continuing to quote the report that came out last week:

The Joint Commander is ultimately responsible for the conduct of his forces. As such the Subcommittee has determined that the Joint Commander MUST have the authority and apparatus necessary to preserve good order and discipline through the military justice system.

Let me repeat the last line.

As such the Subcommittee—

The experts who were looking at this and came out with the report last week—

has determined that the Joint Commander MUST have the authority and apparatus necessary to preserve good order and discipline through the military justice system.

The services can do better, and they will. But the record clearly demonstrates these commanders take their responsibility very seriously, and we should continue to let them lead the men and women of our Armed Forces into battle, bring them home safely, and to use all the tools in the military justice system to enforce their authority.

At the very least, let's give the commanders a chance to implement the changes we ordered them to make as recently as last January before we go imposing more systems on them.

I know it is popular to do this and say we have all these sexual harassments and all that, but these figures speak for themselves. These are facts, and I think we cannot expect our people—our commanders in the field, the ones who are responsible for the lives and deaths of the troops they send into harm's way—to continue to spend all of their time making these changes and not even have time to make the changes we ordered them to do last January.

With that, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KING). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TESTER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO MAX BAUCUS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, in a few minutes Senators will cast votes on two amendments to the farm bill that is now pending before this body. Before we do, I wish to take a minute to acknowledge that the senior Senator from Montana, MAX BAUCUS, has cast more than 12,000 votes over the past three decades in this institution, the Senate. This is a remarkable accomplishment, and it speaks to his dedication to the Senate and to the people of Montana.

He is a hard-working Senator. He learned the value of hard work on a ranch outside of Helena, the capital, in the State of Montana. From the time he was a boy, he was noted as being extremely smart. That is why he was able to obtain both his bachelor's degree and his law degree from one of the most prestigious universities in the world, Stanford University.

I have worked with him the many years I have been here in the Senate. I worked with him when he was chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee during a massive highway bill. He has been a member of the Agriculture Committee for many years.

His mark in this body, though, has been as a member of the Finance Committee. He has done many things. He was involved over the course of the 1982 bill that reformed the Tax Code significantly, called Bradley-Gephardt. MAX BAUCUS was in there working on what he thought was important to Montana and the country.

He became chairman of this very important committee, and he has been instrumental in developing many massive pieces of legislation but nothing more significant than the months and months and months he spent managing the health reform bill, the ObamaCare bill. He has long been an advocate for children's health. He was an advocate for the Children's Health Insurance Program and has fought to strengthen Medicare for seniors all over America and, of course, in his State of Montana.

As I mentioned, he served on the Agriculture Committee, the Environment and Public Works Committee, and the Joint Committee on Taxation. His legislative record is open for everyone to see. It is massive, it is important, and he has done a remarkably good job.

The one thing Senator BAUCUS and I have spent a lot of time talking about is running—not running for office but running with your feet. He is an avid runner. I used to feel and always felt pretty cocky that I have run quite a few marathons, but they pale in comparison to the running MAX BAUCUS has done. No. 1, he is faster than I am, and, No. 2, he can run longer than I can. He has completed a 50-mile race in less than 12 hours. That is remarkable, and he did that less than 10 years ago. This is just one way Max has gone the distance. Anyone willing to spend half a day running must love the outdoors. I am speaking about half a day. That is 12 hours. This is especially true for Max, who enjoys hunting and fishing and has been an important advocate for public lands in Montana and the Nation. He was the author of one the largest conservation bills I know of in American history, except for perhaps some Alaska lands bills, which preserved more than 310,000 acres of forest land in northwestern Montana.

I congratulate Senator BAUCUS on reaching this impressive milestone of 12,000 votes and recognize the contributions he has made to this country are significant.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

REMEMBERING FRANK R. LAUTENBERG

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, today I come to the floor shaken and deeply saddened, as we all are, by the loss of our colleague, my good friend and ally, the senior Senator from New Jersey, Senator FRANK LAUTENBERG. When I think of Senator LAUTENBERG, I think of the word “tenacity.” FRANK LAUTENBERG was tenacious. When he had a setback, he always got right back into the game. He was as tenacious in life as he was here in the Senate, where that tenacity paid off for the people of New Jersey and for the Nation.

When he had a setback with cancer, he did not let himself take 1 minute more than he had to before he got back up and went right back at it. I will always remember his tenacity, a strength of will, and an unshakable resolve that helped him in his own life and in making life better for others.

FRANK LAUTENBERG loved the Senate. He loved his job and the people who elected him time and time again—five times, in fact; the longest serving Senator for the State of New Jersey—people he cared deeply about: working families, seniors, single moms, and the hard-working folks who trusted him always to be on their side, and he was. He was a man for New Jersey, a man for his time—one of the “greatest generation,” the last in the Senate to have served in World War II.

His story was a quintessential American story. His father Sam worked in the silk mills of Paterson, NJ. He sold coal, he farmed, and he once ran a tavern. FRANK lost his father to cancer when he was 19 and he learned the lesson of hard work, having to take on a job nights and weekends until he graduated from Nutley High School, when he joined the Army and went to Europe. When he came back, he went to Columbia University on the GI bill, and he got a degree in economics. He understood the value of that opportunity given to him as a veteran and he extended that forward when he later co-authored the new 21st century GI bill.

Anyone who knew FRANK LAUTENBERG knew he was destined to make something of himself, and he did. He joined two of his boyhood friends to found a very successful business, ADP, and he did it well. But if losing his father, working his way through high school, going to war, starting a business and making a success of himself wasn't enough, FRANK wanted to give something back. He was very comfortable in life and he could have said: I am going to enjoy this hard work and sacrifice that has brought me to this comfortable stage in life, but he considered himself lucky and he wanted to help others. That is why he ran for office. It is why he served and it is why the people of New Jersey kept electing him.

New Jerseyans loved and admired FRANK for what he did for the Nation

and what he did to help them and every American build a better life for themselves and their families. In death, those accomplishments and the love and admiration New Jerseyans have always had for FRANK LAUTENBERG will not diminish, whether it was his landmark drunk driving law, coauthoring the 21st century GI bill, or introducing the toxic right to know law that empowered the public to know what pollutants were being released into their neighborhood, FRANK gave something back to all of us.

We can talk about how hard he fought for the victims of Superstorm Sandy this year. Even in illness he came back to the Senate to try to make sure New Jerseyans and all those who suffered from Superstorm Sandy were taken care of. Or we can talk about how he worked to make the Paterson Great Falls—his hometown he loved so dearly—a national park. But above all, he was Mr. Transportation here in the Senate. Whether it was roads or bridges, airlines or the rail system, he believed in having the best and safest transportation system in the world. And when it comes to air travel, he was way ahead of his time when it came to safety. Let's not forget it was FRANK LAUTENBERG who ended the dangers of smoking on airlines so none of us would be subjected to sitting in a smoke-filled aircraft and with the dangers of smoking on a plane. Today, when I took the Amtrak from Newark to Union Station, I thought through most of that ride of FRANK. I remembered how many times he came to this floor to fight for America's railways, how much he believed in the importance of rail travel and what it meant to keeping this Nation's transportation system competitive.

Given all those accomplishments, it still would not adequately reflect the gift of governing he gave this Nation in the 9,000 votes he cast in this Chamber. Maybe not all of them made the headlines, but they made a difference for every American family. With each of those votes, FRANK LAUTENBERG helped shape the history of America, and not just for his time but for all generations to come.

When I think of FRANK I also certainly not only look back to the fact he was part of that "greatest generation" of World War II veterans, but I also think FRANK may have left us too soon at the age of 89 because he never missed a beat. He lived in the moment. I remember about 3 years ago, in January, he and his wife Bonnie celebrated his 86th birthday in what some might say was an unusual way. FRANK wanted to spend his birthday with his favorite singer. He was a fan of Lady Gaga, and so to celebrate his birthday, he and Bonnie went to Radio City Music Hall for Lady Gaga's Monster Ball Tour.

No, FRANK was not yesterday's news. He was always about today's news, and he lived in the moment. But that moment is gone now. We remember well, and we were lucky to share that mo-

ment with him. Time goes by all too quickly, but the memories last forever. His accomplishments will last forever. They will touch the lives of people well beyond his death, and our image of what it means to learn to live, to learn, to earn, and then give something back will never be forgotten because it lives in FRANK LAUTENBERG's legacy to this Chamber, this Nation, and to the people of my home State.

There is a quote from the Old Testament, from Daniel, chapter 12, and it says:

Many of those who sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake . . . and the wise shall shine brightly like the splendor of the firmament . . . And those who lead the many to justice shall be like the stars forever.

FRANK LAUTENBERG stood for justice in all of its forms for every American every day he served in this Chamber, and his memory shall be like a constellation showing us the way.

Today we say: Thank you, Senator LAUTENBERG, for a life well lived and a job well done. Thank you, on behalf of a grateful State and Nation.

Our deepest thoughts and prayers are with his wife Bonnie and his entire family. I know we will miss him as they will miss him, as the Nation will miss his incredible work.

With that, Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT OFFICER (Mr. COWAN). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 987

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to temporarily set aside the pending amendment so that I may call up my amendment No. 987, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. MORAN] proposes an amendment numbered 987.

Mr. MORAN. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To require the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation to carry out research and development regarding a crop insurance program for alfalfa)

After section 11024, insert the following:

SEC. 110 . . . ALFALFA CROP INSURANCE POLICY.

Section 522(c) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1522(c)) (as amended by section 11024) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(25) ALFALFA CROP INSURANCE POLICY.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The Corporation shall offer to enter into 1 or more contracts with qualified entities to carry out research and development regarding a policy to insure alfalfa.

"(B) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the Corporation shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report that describes the results of the study conducted under subparagraph (A)."

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I was on the floor earlier today describing this amendment, and I will do so very briefly.

This is an amendment to the farm bill that deals with a crop called alfalfa, one that is grown and produced in most States but often not known a lot about, as we discovered in this farm bill discussion. What we know about this crop is that it is very important and used in many ways—to feed cattle and produce milk by feeding dairy cattle—and so it is a very important component in the livestock industry and valuable as feed for both cattle for meat consumption and cattle for dairy consumption.

There is a real challenge in getting crop insurance available for this crop. So this amendment would require the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation to conduct research and development regarding an insurance policy to insure alfalfa and then provide us with a report from the results of that study. There is no cost to the taxpayer. As I understand, this is a noncontroversial amendment.

I see the chairperson of the committee is on the Senate floor, and I would be happy to yield to her.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I urge adoption of the amendment. The Moran amendment follows the philosophy of this farm bill of moving from direct subsidies to crop insurance. It is an important crop, and it is important to make sure that we do have crop insurance tailored to alfalfa growers.

I urge colleagues to support the amendment, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: The Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON), the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS), and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DONNELLY). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 72, nays 18, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 140 Leg.]

YEAS—72

Alexander	Fischer	Merkley
Baldwin	Franken	Mikulski
Barrasso	Gillibrand	Moran
Baucus	Graham	Murray
Begich	Grassley	Nelson
Bennet	Hagan	Portman
Blumenthal	Harkin	Pryor
Blunt	Hatch	Reid
Boozman	Heinrich	Roberts
Brown	Heitkamp	Rockefeller
Burr	Hirono	Sanders
Cantwell	Hoehn	Schatz
Cardin	Inhofe	Schumer
Carper	Isakson	Shaheen
Casey	Johanns	Stabenow
Chambliss	Johnson (SD)	Tester
Cochran	Kaine	Thune
Collins	King	Udall (CO)
Coons	Landrieu	Udall (NM)
Cowan	Leahy	Warner
Crapo	Levin	Warren
Donnelly	McCaskill	Whitehouse
Enzi	McConnell	Wicker
Feinstein	Menendez	Wyden

NAYS—18

Ayotte	Durbin	Reed
Coats	Flake	Risch
Coburn	Heller	Rubio
Corker	Kirk	Scott
Cornyn	Manchin	Shelby
Cruz	Paul	Toomey

NOT VOTING—9

Boxer	Lee	Murphy
Johnson (WI)	McCain	Sessions
Klobuchar	Murkowski	Vitter

The amendment (No. 987) was agreed to.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote, and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

VOTE EXPLANATION

• Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I was unable to attend this roll call vote. Had I been present, I would have voted yea on the Moran amendment No. 974 to require the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation to carry out research and development regarding a crop insurance program for alfalfa. •

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

AMENDMENT NO. 1079

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator COONS and Senator JOHANNIS—I am not sure if Senator JOHANNIS is here—I wish to call up amendment No. 1079 on their behalf. We intend to take this by voice vote this evening.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Michigan [Ms. STABENOW], for Mr. COONS and Mr. JOHANNIS, proposes an amendment numbered 1079.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To modify a provision relating to funding of local and regional food aid procurement projects)

On page 339, line 13, strike “\$40,000,000” and insert “\$60,000,000”.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, this simply increases the authorization for the local and regional procurement program from \$40 million per year to \$60 million per year. It is based on a

pilot project from the last farm bill to test various options on food aid for hungry populations, how to do it faster and more efficiently.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 1079 offered by the Senator from Delaware, Mr. COONS.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I would simply say that this is an amendment we are happy to accept on behalf of Senator COONS, Senator JOHANNIS, Senator DURBIN, Senator ISAKSON, and Senator LEAHY. It would modestly increase the authorization for the local and regional food procurement program. I ask that we accept it on a voice vote.

I yield back the remaining time on both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 1079) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask that I be recorded as voting no on this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Have we completed the vote?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I see colleagues who wish to speak. I wish to thank colleagues for their diligence as we work through amendments on the farm bill. Our goal is to complete this by the end of the week. It is important that we complete this jobs bill. Sixteen million people work in agriculture and are depending on it, and they are depending on us to get it right, as we did a year ago. So I look forward to working with colleagues as we continue to work through the amendment process. I appreciate everybody's hard work.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

HONORING JOEL CAMPORA AND CODY CARPENTER

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, Members of the Senate often come to the floor and talk about our men and women in uniform and their incredible bravery and the sacrifice they make for our country, and that is true. We certainly honor them and appreciate them for all they do for our country as they serve us overseas. However, there are other men and women in uniform who also serve our country by serving our citizens in our communities, and those are our policemen and policewomen and others in law enforcement as well as first responders and others who wear a uniform as well.

I rise today to honor two heroes from Arkansas. Last week we lost a sheriff and a game warden who were trying to help victims of a flood in our State. These two first responders answered the call when there was an emergency, a dire situation. They jumped in their

vehicles and headed to the danger. They got into a boat, and they went to a home of some victims who were stranded and very much in danger by the floodwaters. Unfortunately, all four lost their lives in this terrible incident in Arkansas.

Arkansas game and fish wildlife officer Joel Campora and sheriff Cody Carpenter of Scott County both drowned while assisting victims in this overnight flash flood near Y City, AR. In times of distress such as these, we should come together to help others, which is exactly what they were doing as they sacrificed their lives for others. They put others' needs ahead of their own because of their sense of duty and honor and their belief in helping their fellow man.

In closing, I wish to commend these men and offer condolences to their families for their sacrifice.

I yield to my colleague from Arkansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I also wish to take a pause. It seems as though for the last several weeks on a very regular basis storms have been ravaging the country and different events have been occurring where we have had cause to pause, and certainly this tragedy that struck Arkansas is one. So we would like for our colleagues to keep in their thoughts and prayers those in western Arkansas who have suffered this flood.

As the Senator from Arkansas said, six people lost their lives to the terrible storm that brought significant flooding to western Arkansas late last week. Scott County sheriff Cody Carpenter and wildlife officer Joel Campora, two dedicated public servants, were among them. They gave their lives while responding to a 9-1-1 call at a home in Y City. The two arrived at a home to help two female victims trapped by the flooding. While they were there, the house exploded, killing all four of them. Additionally, a Grant County man was killed when a tree fell on him as a result of the storm.

These are people who are true heroes not because of the way they died but because of the way they lived their lives.

Sheriff Carpenter was a leader who was never content to sit behind the desk. He bravely put the safety of others before his own to protect those in harm's way. He rose from a dispatcher to deputy, chief deputy, and then finally sheriff. He was a man of faith who loved life, loved his family, loved his job, and loved the Lord.

Officer Campora began his law enforcement career in Mena, AR. In 2007 he became a wildlife officer for the Arkansas Game and Fish Commission. His desire to serve led him down this career path, but it also led him to serve

as a volunteer youth minister for the Salem Baptist Church and Pencil Bluff First Baptist Church.

Again, these were ordinary people doing extraordinary deeds.

Sheriff Carpenter left behind his wife Aime Beth and four children: Garren, Christian, Douglas, and Irelynn. Officer Campora left behind his wife Rebecca and two daughters: Dacie and Bethany.

Again, we would very much like everyone to remember these families and keep them in their thoughts and prayers as time goes on.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REMEMBERING FRANK R. LAUTENBERG

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I come to the floor this evening with a very sad heart to speak about one of our colleagues here in the Senate who gave tremendous service to his country and sadly passed away last night.

Senator FRANK LAUTENBERG was a true American. He earned a lot throughout his lifetime, but he came here to the Senate floor to fight for all of those people who didn't have the ability to fight for themselves. He was here in the Senate with us just a few weeks ago even though he himself was battling an extremely difficult illness.

I think of FRANK LAUTENBERG as a man of tremendous determination, an awful lot of grit, and someone who really embodies the term "happy warrior." He wanted to be here to fight for those who didn't have what he did. Throughout his career, that is exactly what he did.

FRANK lived the American dream. He was the son of poor immigrants, and he rose to become a chief executive of a business that employed thousands of people around the world. He personally did very well, but he was never satisfied with just his own personal success. He understood, as so many other great Americans, that his success was based on the opportunities this country afforded him. So he chose over three decades to give back and to fight for people to make sure they had the opportunities he had.

He started his career in the Senate back in 1982. As many of us who served with him know, he decided to retire, but he was not happy in retirement. He wanted to be here doing what he loved—being a Senator and fighting for the people of his home State of New Jersey and fighting for Americans all over to have the opportunities I just spoke about. He made it his mission to make sure the ladders that were there for him were there for the generations that came behind him.

He was a proud World War II veteran—in fact, the last this body will know. He fought for the post-9/11 GI bill because, as did my dad, who was also a World War II veteran, he had used the GI bill after World War II. He knew it was the key to unlocking the knowledge that powered the "greatest

generation." He wanted that for those who came behind him.

His desire to stand for the powerless is also why he championed legislation to protect families from gun violence, why he stood to safeguard families against dangerous chemicals time and time again, and why he took on the powerful to ban smoking on airplanes and to bring about tougher drunk driving protections.

I personally will always remember FRANK's passion for transportation. He chaired the Transportation and Housing and Urban Development Appropriations Subcommittee before I did, and I spent many years working with him to make sure we funded the infrastructure of this country—rail, highway, airline safety issues.

FRANK's legacy really is that his direct work saved lives. He saved lives. He helped to build transportation networks that brought families, businesses, and communities together. He wanted a better life for families in America. He was a champion for the underserved and underrepresented.

How many times have I been on the floor feeling like a lonely voice—fighting for women's health care issues or fighting for the protection of families against hazardous chemicals or fighting for victims of domestic violence—and time and time again FRANK LAUTENBERG would come over here to stand beside and fight with me, no matter what the time of day or the late hour of the night, because that was his passion and his cause.

He was a passionate public servant. He was not afraid to fight and vote for what he believed. He could never understand anyone who came here and tried to figure out which way the winds were blowing in order to take a vote. FRANK came and was passionate about whom he cared for, and he did not care about the political consequences. He wanted to fight for the underserved.

He loved the Senate. In fact, he loved it so much that one tour of duty was not enough and service called him back, as I said. Up until just a few days ago, nothing could stop FRANK from taking Amtrak down here to fight for the issues he believed in and the people of New Jersey whom he represented so well.

FRANK LAUTENBERG gave everything he had to public service, and those who served with him, as I was so fortunate to do, know it gave him all the satisfaction in the world.

He is going to be missed by all of us. He will be missed for his determination, for his passion, for always caring, and for fighting for what was right for all the people in this country.

I just wish to say tonight that my thoughts and prayers are with Bonnie and all of his family as they struggle with this loss but to know that his legacy lives on in the safety and caring of so many families in this country for whom he worked so passionately and hard.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BERWICK, ME

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President. I rise today to commemorate the 300th anniversary of the town of Berwick, ME. As the ninth incorporated town in Maine, Berwick holds a very special place in our State's history, and one that exemplifies the determination and resiliency of Maine people.

While this landmark anniversary marks Berwick's incorporation, the year 1713 was but one milestone in a long journey of progress. It is a journey that began thousands of years earlier with Native American villages on the banks of the Piscataqua and Salmon Falls Rivers. In 1631, barely a decade after the Pilgrims landed at Plymouth Rock, Ambrose Gibbens established a settlement at Quampeagan Falls and built the first sawmill in North America. That manufacturing heritage has remained strong in the three communities known today as The Berwicks, from the textile and iron works of the 18th century to the cutting-edge biotechnology and aerospace industries of today.

Industry is only part of Berwick's story. During the Revolutionary War, the town provided two full companies to fight for America's independence, more than many towns of greater size. The courage and character demonstrated by the townspeople in standing for liberty echo throughout Berwick's history. In the years before the Civil War, the many churches in town were powerful voices for the abolition of slavery. During that terrible conflict, more than 200 of Berwick's young men fought, and many died, so that all might live in freedom. The town's honor roll of current military personnel demonstrates an ongoing commitment to our Nation's founding principles.

This anniversary is not just about something that is measured in calendar years. It is about human accomplishment. We celebrate the people who, for more than three centuries, have pulled together, cared for one another, and built a great community that is a wonderful place to live, work, and raise families. Thanks to those who came before, Berwick has a wonderful history.

Thanks to those who are here today, it has a bright future.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO TERRY SCHOW

• Mr. LEE. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize Terry Schow for his exemplary work in behalf of Veterans in the State of Utah.

Mr. Schow has provided a strong voice and steady hand in fighting for the critical services our veterans need and deserve. Three Utah Governors recognized and tapped into his tremendous talent and unchallenged commitment to our veterans. He was appointed as Director of the Utah Division of Veterans Affairs in October 2001 by Governor Michael O. Leavitt. Governor Jon M. Huntsman Jr. then appointed Mr. Schow as Executive Director of the Utah Department of Veterans Affairs and Governor W. Herbert named him to the same post.

Terry Schow is a U.S. Army Veteran who served in the 5th and 10th Special Forces Groups and the 25th Infantry Division. He also served a tour of duty in Southeast Asia.

Mr. Schow has demonstrated through his long years of service what it means to honor the promises we make as a country to those who stand in harms way defending our freedom. He paid special attention to our veterans who suffer from mental and emotional challenges and the troubling trend of suicide among veterans. Terry Schow worked tirelessly to ensure we never lose a member of the military whether on the battlefield or long after they have left active duty.

Terry Schow's efforts have improved the quality of life for countless Utah veterans through increased access to critical care and specialized services. I thank Mr. Terry Schow for his extraordinary impact on our veterans.●

TRIBUTE TO DAVID McCULLEN

• Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, today I wish to honor David McCullen, a veteran of the war in Vietnam. David, on behalf of all Montanans and all Americans, I stand to say thank you for your service to this Nation. It is my honor to share the story of David's service because no story of heroism should ever go unrecognized.

David was born in Miles City, MT, in February of 1949. Soon after, his family moved to California, where he attended Asuza High School near Los Angeles. While in high school, David was a wrestler, lettering in the sport his senior year. After graduating from high school, David joined the famed 101st Airborne Division—known as the Screaming Eagles—and began training at Fort Ord.

David then attended advanced individual training at Fort Gordon and jump school at Fort Benning—both in Georgia.

On May 8, 1969, David left for Vietnam. Just 2 days later, David's regiment was assigned to Operation Apache Snow and took part in the mission that became known as the Battle of Hamburger Hill. This hard-fought offensive became the basis for several movies and books about the Vietnam war. For over a week, American forces attempted to take Hill 937. Seventy-two American soldiers were killed in the battle, and more than 300 were wounded. For its heroism, David's battalion was awarded the Presidential Unit Citation.

After a 2-year tour in the military, David returned to California, living there and in Iowa for many years. David moved back home to Miles City in 2000.

Today, in our presence, it is my honor to present David with his Presidential Unit Citation; Republic of Vietnam Gallantry Cross Unit Citation with Palm Device and Republic of Vietnam Civil Actions Honor Medal Unit Citation, First Class. These decorations are small tokens, but they are powerful symbols of true heroism, sacrifice, and dedication to service. These medals are presented on behalf of a grateful nation.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

REPORT RELATIVE TO THE ISSUANCE OF AN EXECUTIVE ORDER TO TAKE ADDITIONAL STEPS WITH RESPECT TO THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY ORIGINALLY DECLARED ON MARCH 15, 1995 IN EXECUTIVE ORDER 12957 WITH RESPECT TO IRAN—PM 11

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 *et seq.*) (IEEPA), I hereby report that I have issued an Executive Order (the "order") that takes additional steps with respect to the national emergency declared in Executive Order 12957 of March 15, 1995, and implements

certain statutory requirements of the Iran Freedom and Counter-Proliferation Act of 2012 (subtitle D of title XII of Public Law 112-239) (22 U.S.C. 8801 *et seq.*) (IFCA), which amends the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-195) (22 U.S.C. 8501 *et seq.*) (CISADA).

In Executive Order 12957, the President found that the actions and policies of the Government of Iran threaten the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. To deal with that threat, the President declared a national emergency and imposed prohibitions on certain transactions with respect to the development of Iranian petroleum resources. To further respond to that threat, Executive Order 12959 of May 6, 1995, imposed comprehensive trade and financial sanctions on Iran. Executive Order 13059 of August 19, 1997, consolidated and clarified the previous orders. To take additional steps with respect to the national emergency declared in Executive Order 12957 and to implement section 105(a) of CISADA, I issued Executive Order 13553 on September 28, 2010, to impose sanction on officials of the Government of Iran and other persons acting on behalf of the Government of Iran determined to be responsible for or complicit in certain serious human rights abuses.

To take additional steps with respect to the threat posed by Iran and to provide implementing authority for a number of the sanctions set forth in the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-172) (50 U.S.C. 1701 note) (ISA) as amended by CISADA, I issued Executive Order 13574 on May 23, 2011, to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to implement certain sanctions imposed by the Secretary of State pursuant to ISA, as amended by CISADA. I also issued Executive Order 13590 on November 20, 2011, to take additional steps with respect to this emergency by authorizing the Secretary of State to impose sanctions on persons providing certain goods, services, technology, or support that contribute either to Iran's development of petroleum resources or to Iran's production of petrochemicals, and to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to implement some of those sanctions. On February 5, 2012, in order to take further steps pursuant to this emergency, and to implement section 1245(c) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112-81) (22 U.S.C. 8513a), I issued Executive Order 13599 blocking the property of the Government of Iran, all Iranian financial institutions, and persons determined to be owned or controlled by, or acting for or on behalf of, such parties. On April 22, 2012, and May 1, 2012, I issued Executive Orders 13606 and 13608, respectively. Executive Orders 13606 and 13608 each take additional steps with respect to various emergencies, including the emergency declared in Executive Order 12957 concerning Iran, to address the

use of computer and information technology to commit serious human rights abuses and efforts by foreign persons to evade sanctions.

To take additional steps with respect to the national emergency declared in Executive Order 12957, I issued Executive Order 13622 of July 30, 2012, imposing further sanctions in light of the Government of Iran's use of revenues from petroleum, petroleum products, and petrochemicals for illicit purposes; Iran's continued attempts to evade international sanctions through deceptive practices; and the unacceptable risk posed to the international financial system by Iran's activities.

Most recently, I issued Executive Order 13628 of October 9, 2012, to take additional steps with respect to the national emergency declared in Executive Order 12957 and to implement certain statutory requirements of the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012 (Public Law 112-158) (22 U.S.C. 8701 *et seq.*) (TRA), including its amendments to the statutory requirements of ISA and CISADA.

With respect to the order that I have just issued, section 1 of the order authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State, to impose financial sanctions on or to block all property and interests in property that are in the United States, that come within the United States, or that are or come within the possession or control of any United States person (including any foreign branch) of a foreign financial institution determined to have, on or after the effective date of the order:

knowingly conducted or facilitated any significant transaction related to the purchase or sale of Iranian rials or a derivative, swap, future, forward, or other similar contract whose value is based on the exchange rate of the Iranian rial; or

maintained significant funds or accounts outside the territory of Iran denominated in the Iranian rial.

Section 2 of the order authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State, to block all property and interests in property that are in the United States, that come within the United States, or that are or come within the possession or control of any United States person (including any foreign branch) of any person upon determining:

that the person has materially assisted, sponsored, or provided financial, material, or technological support for, or goods or services to or in support of, any Iranian person included on the list of Specially Designated Nationals and Blocked Persons maintained by the Office of Foreign Assets Control (SDN List) (other than an Iranian depository institution whose property and interests in property are blocked solely pursuant to Executive Order 13599) or any other person included on the SDN List whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to this paragraph or Executive Order 13599 (other than an Iranian depository institution whose property and interests in property are blocked solely pursuant to Executive Order 13599); or

pursuant to authority delegated by the President and in accordance with the terms

of such delegation, that sanctions shall be imposed on such person pursuant to section 1244(c)(1)(A) of IFCA.

Section 3 of the order authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State, to impose financial sanctions on a foreign financial institution determined to have knowingly conducted or facilitated any significant financial transaction:

on behalf of any Iranian person included on the SDN List (other than an Iranian depository institution whose property and interests in property are blocked solely pursuant to Executive Order 13599) or any other person included on the SDN List whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to subsection 2(a)(1) of the order or Executive Order 13599 (other than an Iranian depository institution whose property and interests in property are blocked solely pursuant to Executive Order 13599); or

on or after the effective date of the order, for the sale, supply, or transfer to Iran of significant goods or services used in connection with the automotive sector of Iran.

Section 5 of the order authorizes the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Homeland Security, and the United States Trade Representative, and with the President of the Export-Import Bank, the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and other agencies and officials as appropriate, to impose sanctions on a person upon determining that the person:

on or after the effective date of the order, knowingly engaged in a significant transaction for the sale, supply, or transfer to Iran of significant goods or services used in connection with the automotive sector of Iran;

is a successor entity to a person determined to meet that criterion;

owns or controls a person determined to meet that criterion, and had knowledge that the person engaged in the activities referred to therein; or

is owned or controlled by, or under common ownership or control with, a person determined to meet that criterion, and knowingly participated in the activities therein.

Sections 6 and 7 of the order provide that, for persons determined to meet any of these criteria, the heads of the relevant agencies, in consultation with the Secretary of State, shall implement the sanctions imposed by the Secretary of State. Those sanctions may include the following actions:

the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank shall deny approval of the issuance of any guarantee, insurance, extension of credit, or participation in an extension of credit in connection with the export of any goods or services to the sanctioned person;

agencies shall not issue any specific license or grant any other specific permission or authority under any statute that requires the prior review and approval of the United States Government as a condition for the export or reexport of goods or technology to the sanctioned person;

for a sanctioned person that is a financial institution: the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the President of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York shall take such actions as they deem appropriate, including denying

designation, or terminating the continuation of any prior designation of, the sanctioned person as a primary dealer in United States Government debt instruments; or agencies shall prevent the sanctioned person from serving as an agent of the United States Government or serving as a repository for United States Government funds;

agencies shall not procure, or enter into a contract for the procurement of, any goods or services from the sanctioned person;

the Secretary of State shall deny a visa to, and the Secretary of Homeland Security shall exclude from the United States, any alien that the Secretary of State determines is a corporate officer or principal of, or a shareholder with a controlling interest in, a sanctioned person;

the heads of the relevant agencies, as appropriate, shall impose on the principal executive officer or officers, or persons performing similar functions and with similar authorities, of a sanctioned person any of the sanctions described above, as selected by the Secretary of State;

the Secretary of the Treasury shall take actions where necessary to:

prohibit any United States financial institution from making loans or providing credits to the sanctioned person totaling more than \$10,000,000 in any 12-month period, unless such person is engaged in activities to relieve human suffering and the loans or credits are provided for such activities;

prohibit any transactions in foreign exchange that are subject to the jurisdiction of the United States and in which the sanctioned person has any interest;

prohibit any transfers of credit or payments between financial institutions or by, through, or to any financial institution, to the extent that such transfers or payments are subject to the jurisdiction of the United States and involve any interest of the sanctioned person;

block all property and interests in property that are in the United States, that come within the United States, or that are or come within the possession or control of any United States person, (including any foreign branch) of the sanctioned person, and provide that such property and interests in property may not be transferred, paid, exported, withdrawn, or otherwise dealt in;

prohibit any United States person from investing in or purchasing significant amounts of equity or debt instruments of a sanctioned person;

restrict or prohibit imports of goods, technology, or services, directly or indirectly, into the United States from the sanctioned person; or

impose on the principal executive officer or officers, or persons performing similar functions and with similar authorities, of a sanctioned person any of the sanctions described above, as appropriate.

Section 7 of the order also provides that, when the Secretary of State or the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to authority delegated by the President and in accordance with the terms of such delegation, has determined that sanctions shall be imposed on a person pursuant to section 1244(d)(1)(A), 1245(a)(1), or 1246(a)(1) of IFCA (including in each case as informed by section 1253(c)(2) of IFCA), such Secretary may select one or more of the sanctions described above for which the Secretary of the Treasury shall take such action, and the Secretary of the Treasury shall take actions where necessary to implement those sanctions.

Sections 8 and 11 of the order implement the statutory requirements of

CISADA, as amended by sanction 1249 of IFCA. They authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to block all property and interests in property that are in the United States, or that are or come within the possession or control of any United States person (including any foreign branch), and the Secretary of State to suspend entry into the United States, of persons determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with or at the recommendation of the Secretary of State:

to have engaged, on or after January 2, 2013, in corruption or other activities relating to the diversion of goods, including agricultural commodities, food, medicine, and medical devices, intended for the people of Iran;

to have engaged, on or after January 2, 2013, in corruption or other activities relating to the misappropriation of proceeds from the sale or resale of goods described above;

to have materially assisted, sponsored, or provided financial, material, or technological support for, or goods or services to or in support of, the activities described above or any person whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to these provisions; or

to be owned or controlled by, or to have acted or purported to act for or on behalf of, directly or indirectly, any person whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to these provisions.

I have delegated to the Secretary of the Treasury the authority, in consultation with the Secretary of State, to take such actions, including the promulgation of rules and regulations, and to employ all powers granted to the President by IEEPA, as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of the order, other than the purposes described in sections 5, 6, and 11 of the order. All agencies of the United States Government are directed to take all appropriate measures within their authority to carry out the provisions of the order.

The order, a copy of which is enclosed, becomes effective at 12:01 a.m. eastern daylight time on July 1, 2013.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 3, 2013.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 3, 2013, the Secretary of the Senate, on May 24, 2013, during the adjournment of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution, without amendment:

S. Con. Res. 17. Concurrent resolution providing for a conditional adjournment or recess of the Senate and an adjournment of the House of Representatives.

The message further announced that pursuant to the National Foundation of the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 955(b) note), the Minority Leader re-appoints the following Member of the House of Representatives to the National Council of the Arts: Ms. BETTY MCCOLLUM of Minnesota.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 3, 2013, the Secretary of the Senate, on May 24, 2013, during the adjournment of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the Acting Speaker pro-tempore (Mr. WOLF) has signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 258. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, with respect to fraudulent representations about having received military decorations or medals.

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 3, 2013, the enrolled bill was signed on May 24, 2013, during the adjournment of the Senate, by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. LEVIN).

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 2:09 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1911. An act to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to establish interest rates for new loans made on or after July 1, 2013, to direct the Secretary of Education to convene the Advisory Committee on Improving Postsecondary Education Data to conduct a study on improvements to postsecondary education transparency at the Federal level, and for other purposes.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bills were read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 3. An act to approve the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Keystone XL pipeline, and for other purposes.

H.R. 271. An act to clarify that compliance with an emergency order under section 202(c) of the Federal Power Act may not be considered a violation of any Federal, State, or local environmental law or regulation, and for other purposes.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES DURING ADJOURNMENT

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. LEAHY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 744. A bill to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WYDEN, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources:

Report to accompany S. 306, a bill to authorize all Bureau of Reclamation conduit facilities for hydropower development under Federal Reclamation law, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113-35).

Report to accompany S. 545, a bill to improve hydropower, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113-36).

Report to accompany S. 761, a bill to promote energy savings in residential and com-

mercial buildings and industry, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113-37).

Report to accompany H.R. 267, a bill to improve hydropower, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113-38).

Report to accompany H.R. 678, a bill to authorize all Bureau of Reclamation conduit facilities for hydropower development under Federal Reclamation law, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113-39).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 1084. A bill to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to establish the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy as the lead Federal agency for coordinating Federal, State, and local assistance provided to promote the energy retrofitting of schools; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. CASEY):

S. 1085. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives for small businesses; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. MIKULSKI (for herself, Mr. BURR, Mr. HARKIN, and Mr. ALEXANDER):

S. 1086. A bill to reauthorize and improve the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 162

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 162, a bill to reauthorize and improve the Mentally Ill Offender Treatment and Crime Reduction Act of 2004.

S. 186

At the request of Mr. SHELBY, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 186, a bill to award posthumously a Congressional Gold Medal to Addie Mae Collins, Denise McNair, Carole Robertson, and Cynthia Wesley, in recognition of the 50th anniversary of the bombing of the Sixteenth Street Baptist Church, where the 4 little Black girls lost their lives, which served as a catalyst for the Civil Rights Movement.

S. 346

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 346, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit veterans who have a service-connected, permanent disability rated as total to travel on military aircraft in the same manner and to the same extent as retired members of the Armed Forces entitled to such travel.

S. 403

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from New York

(Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. COWAN), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN), and the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 403, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to address and take action to prevent bullying and harassment of students.

S. 420

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL), and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) were added as cosponsors of S. 420, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the logical flow of return information between partnerships, corporations, trusts, estates, and individuals to better enable each party to submit timely, accurate returns and reduce the need for extended and amended returns, to provide for modified due dates by regulation, and to conform the automatic corporate extension period to longstanding regulatory rule.

S. 460

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 460, a bill to provide for an increase in the Federal minimum wage.

S. 470

At the request of Mr. JOHANNIS, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 470, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to require that the Purple Heart occupy a position of precedence above the new Distinguished Warfare Medal.

S. 501

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 501, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and increase the exclusion for benefits provided to volunteer firefighters and emergency medical responders.

S. 506

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 506, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide recruitment and retention incentives for volunteer emergency service workers.

S. 534

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 534, a bill to reform the National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers, and for other purposes.

S. 569

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 569, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to count a period

of receipt of outpatient observation services in a hospital toward satisfying the 3-day inpatient hospital requirement for coverage of skilled nursing facility services under Medicare.

S. 600

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 600, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to reform and reduce fraud and abuse in certain visa programs for aliens working temporarily in the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 602

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 602, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the participation of physical therapists in the National Health Service Corps Loan Repayment Program, and for other purposes.

S. 674

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) and the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) were added as cosponsors of S. 674, a bill to require prompt responses from the heads of covered Federal agencies when the Secretary of Veterans Affairs requests information necessary to adjudicate claims for benefits under laws administered by the Secretary, and for other purposes.

S. 682

At the request of Mr. COBURN, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 682, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to reset interest rates for new student loans.

S. 700

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the names of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. COWAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 700, a bill to ensure that the education and training provided members of the Armed Forces and veterans better assists members and veterans in obtaining civilian certifications and licenses, and for other purposes.

S. 734

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 734, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to repeal the requirement for reduction of survivor annuities under the Survivor Benefit Plan by veterans' dependency and indemnity compensation.

S. 749

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 749, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the 15-year recovery period for qualified leasehold improvement property, qualified restaurant property, and qualified retail improvement property.

S. 783

At the request of Mr. HEINRICH, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 783, a bill to amend the Helium Act to improve helium stewardship, and for other purposes.

S. 789

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 789, a bill to grant the Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the First Special Service Force, in recognition of its superior service during World War II.

S. 815

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 815, a bill to prohibit the employment discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity.

S. 829

At the request of Mrs. HAGAN, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 829, a bill to improve the financial literacy of students.

S. 842

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 842, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for an extension of the Medicare-dependent hospital (MDH) program and the increased payments under the Medicare low-volume hospital program.

S. 864

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 864, a bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to reauthorize technical assistance to small public water systems, and for other purposes.

S. 871

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 871, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to enhance assistance for victims of sexual assault committed by members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

S. 878

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 878, a bill to amend title 9 of the United States Code with respect to arbitration.

S. 886

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 886, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect pain-capable

unborn children in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

S. 896

At the request of Mr. BEGICH, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 896, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to repeal the Government pension offset and windfall elimination provisions.

S. 897

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) and the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 897, a bill to prevent the doubling of the interest rate for Federal subsidized student loans for the 2013-2014 academic year by providing funds for such loans through the Federal Reserve System, to ensure that such loans are available at interest rates that are equivalent to the interest rates at which the Federal Government provides loans to banks through the discount window operated by the Federal Reserve System, and for other purposes.

S. 950

At the request of Mr. PAUL, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 950, a bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to allow a veterinarian to transport and dispense controlled substances in the usual course of veterinary practice outside of the registered location.

S. 953

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 953, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to extend the reduced interest rate for undergraduate Federal Direct Stafford Loans, to modify required distribution rules for pension plans, to limit earnings stripping by expatriated entities, to provide for modifications related to the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund, and for other purposes.

S. 963

At the request of Mr. COBURN, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 963, a bill preventing an unrealistic future Medicaid augmentation plan.

S. 964

At the request of Mrs. MCCASKILL, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 964, a bill to require a comprehensive review of the adequacy of the training, qualifications, and experience of the Department of Defense personnel responsible for sexual assault prevention and response for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

S. 965

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 965, a bill to eliminate oil exports from Iran by expanding domestic production.

S. 967

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) were added as cosponsors of S. 967, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to modify various authorities relating to procedures for courts-martial under the Uniform Code of Military Justice, and for other purposes.

S. 980

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 980, a bill to provide for enhanced embassy security, and for other purposes.

S. 987

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) were added as cosponsors of S. 987, a bill to maintain the free flow of information to the public by providing conditions for the federally compelled disclosure of information by certain persons connected with the news media.

S. 1003

At the request of Mr. COBURN, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1003, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to reset interest rates for new student loans.

S. 1032

At the request of Mrs. MCCASKILL, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1032, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to make certain improvements in the Uniform Code of Military Justice related to sex-related offenses committed by members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

S. CON. RES. 15

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 15, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the Chained Consumer Price Index should not be used to calculate cost-of-living adjustments for Social Security or veterans benefits, or to increase the tax burden on low- and middle-income taxpayers.

S. RES. 75

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) and the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 75, a resolution condemning the Government of Iran for its state-sponsored persecution of its Baha'i minority and its continued violation of the International Covenants on Human Rights.

S. RES. 154

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) was added as a cosponsor of

S. Res. 154, a resolution supporting political reform in Iran and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 966

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 966 intended to be proposed to S. 954, an original bill to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018.

AMENDMENT NO. 1027

At the request of Mr. HEINRICH, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1027 intended to be proposed to S. 954, an original bill to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018.

AMENDMENT NO. 1077

At the request of Mr. HEINRICH, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1077 intended to be proposed to S. 954, an original bill to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018.

AMENDMENT NO. 1079

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1079 proposed to S. 954, an original bill to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018.

AMENDMENT NO. 1082

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1082 intended to be proposed to S. 954, an original bill to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018.

AMENDMENT NO. 1096

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1096 intended to be proposed to S. 954, an original bill to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018.

AMENDMENT NO. 1099

At the request of Mr. BEGICH, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1099 intended to be proposed to S. 954, an original bill to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018.

AMENDMENT NO. 1102

At the request of Mr. JOHANNIS, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) and the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1102 intended to be proposed to S. 954, an original bill to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018.

AMENDMENT NO. 1115

At the request of Mr. BEGICH, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1115 intended to be proposed to S. 954, an original bill to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018.

AMENDMENT NO. 1120

At the request of Mr. JOHANNIS, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr.

ROBERTS), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) and the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1120 intended to be proposed to S. 954, an original bill to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018.

AMENDMENT NO. 1130

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1130 intended to be proposed to S. 954, an original bill to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED
BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. CASEY):

S. 1085. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives for small businesses; to the Committee on Finance.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise to speak about legislation, the Small Business Tax Certainty and Growth Act of 2013, which I introduced today along with my friend and colleague, Senator CASEY.

Small businesses are our Nation's job creators. Firms with fewer than 500 employees generate about 50 percent of our Nation's GDP, account for more than 99 percent of employers and employ nearly half of all workers. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, firms with fewer than 500 employees accounted for 65 percent of the new jobs created from 1993 to 2009.

Even the smallest firms have a huge effect on our economy. Small Business Administration data indicate that businesses with fewer than 20 employees accounted for 18 percent of all private sector jobs in 2010.

The Small Business Tax Certainty and Growth Act of 2013 allows small businesses to plan for capital investments that are vital to expansion and job creation. Our bill eases complex accounting rules for the smallest businesses, and it reduces the tax burden on newly formed ventures.

Recent studies by the National Federation of Independent Business, NFIB, indicate that taxes are the number one concern of small business owners, and that constant change in the tax code is among their chief concerns. A key feature of this bill is that it provides the certainty small businesses need to create and implement long-term capital investment plans, which are vital to growth. For example, section 179 of the Internal Revenue Code allows small businesses to deduct the cost of acquired assets more rapidly. The amount of the maximum allowable deduction has changed three times in the past 6 years, and is usually addressed as a year-end "extender," making this tax benefit unpredictable from year to year, and therefore difficult for small businesses to take full advantage of in their long-range planning. Our bill permanently sets the maximum allowable

deduction under section 179 at \$250,000, indexed for inflation, and ensures that only small businesses can take advantage of the benefit because it phases out as acquisitions exceed \$800,000.

The Small Business Tax Certainty and Growth Act of 2013 also allows more companies to use the intuitive cash method of accounting by permanently doubling the threshold at which the more complex accrual method is required, from \$5 million in gross receipts to \$10 million. This includes an expansion in the ability of small businesses to use simplified methods of accounting for inventories.

The bill also eases the tax burden on new businesses by permanently doubling the deduction for start-up expenses from \$5,000 to \$10,000. Like section 179, this benefit is limited to small businesses, and the deduction phases out for expenses exceeding \$60,000.

The Small Business Tax Certainty and Growth Act of 2013 extends for one year provisions which provide benefits to businesses large and small—so-called "bonus depreciation" and 15-year depreciation for improvements with respect to restaurants, retail facilities, and leaseholds. Although permanence is important, I believe that tax provisions that affect businesses of all sizes should be debated and addressed in the context of comprehensive, pro-growth tax reform, which I urge the Senate to undertake.

The provisions in the Small Business Tax Certainty and Growth Act of 2013 would make a real difference in our Nation's small businesses' ability to survive and thrive. I recently spoke with Rob Tod, the founder of Allagash Brewing Company, which is based in Portland, ME. Allagash makes some of the best craft beer in the country. It started as a one-man operation in 1995. In the 18 years since, it has grown into a firm that employs approximately 65 people and distributes craft beer throughout the United States. Rob noted that his company's expansion was fueled in part by bonus depreciation and section 179 expensing. New to the craft beer business, Rob had difficulty obtaining financing on favorable terms. But these cost recovery provisions allowed Rob to pay less in taxes in the years he acquired the equipment needed to expand his business. Those tax savings were then reinvested in his business, thus creating jobs. This economic benefit is multiplied when you consider the effect of Allagash's investment on the equipment manufacturers, the transportation companies needed to haul new equipment to his brewery, the increased inventory in his brewery, and the suppliers of the materials needed to brew additional beer.

In light of the positive effects this bill would have on small businesses and our economy, I urge my colleagues to support the Small Business Tax Certainty and Growth Act of 2013. This bill has been endorsed by the NFIB, an important voice for small business.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter of support be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF
INDEPENDENT BUSINESS,
Washington, DC, June 3, 2013.

Hon. SUSAN COLLINS,
U.S. Senate, Dirksen Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR COLLINS: On behalf of the National Federation of Independent Business (NFIB), the nation's leading small business advocacy organization, I am writing in support of the Small Business Tax Certainty and Growth Act of 2013, which provides permanency and certainty to small businesses regarding several tax provisions including Section 179, cash accounting, and deductions for startup and organizational expenses.

The most important source of financing for small business is their earnings, i.e. cash flow, which is closely tied to a small business' overall tax burden. In NFIB Research Foundation's Problems and Priorities, five of the top ten small business concerns are tax related. The preservation of cash flow is a key element for small businesses as Congress considers comprehensive tax reform.

Cost recovery for capital investments is closely tied to a small business' effective tax rate and its ability to manage cash flow. Section 179 expensing—especially with the inclusion of real property—provides small businesses with an immediate source of capital recovery and improved cash flow. We appreciate you including this in your legislation. Additionally, small businesses would benefit from an expanded ability to use cash accounting for tax purposes. Permitting more business entities with higher gross receipts to use cash accounting helps small businesses to manage cash flow because it better reflects the business owner's ability to pay taxes. We appreciate you including both of these provisions in your bill.

Thank you for introducing this important legislation, and we look forward to working with you to provide for permanent small business tax incentives as the 113th Congress moves forward.

Sincerely,

SUSAN ECKERLY,
Senior Vice President,
Public Policy.

By Ms. MIKULSKI (for herself,
Mr. BURR, Mr. HARKIN, and Mr.
ALEXANDER):

S. 1086. A bill to reauthorize and improve the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 2013, along with Senators BURR, HARKIN, and ALEXANDER.

For the past year, our offices have worked on a bipartisan basis to draft a comprehensive reauthorization of the Child Care Development Block Grant, CCDBG, a program that helps low- and moderate-income working families access and afford child care. This program helps working parents keep working, it helps parents who are in school stay in school, and it is supposed to ensure that children are in safe environments that support their physical,

emotional, and cognitive development. It is a vital program and its reauthorization is of the utmost importance.

We did not draft this reauthorization in a vacuum. We held three public hearings in the Subcommittee on Children and Families, and we worked closely with all members, Democrat and Republican, of the Senate Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee. We also asked for input and recommendations from folks on the ground since we know that parents, child care providers, and early learning and developmental experts, know best how this program works and how it can be improved. It is my hope that the bill we're introducing today represents all of the good ideas that have been brought to us throughout this process.

It is noteworthy that the CCDBG program has not been reauthorized since 1996. The last time we reauthorized CCDBG was during welfare reform. At that time, the program was envisioned solely as a workforce aid—something to help moms and dads get back to work or school. This was, and remains, an important goal, but we have learned a lot since 1996. We know that child care can, and should, be constructed in such a way that benefits both the parent and the child: it should allow parents to go to work or school, but it should also give kids the building blocks to be successful in their lives.

What we know today, that we didn't 17 years ago, is that the most rapid period of development for the brain happens in the first 5 years of life. That is why it is so imperative that we ensure our children are in high-quality child care programs. While important, it is not enough to simply ensure that kids have someplace to go. We must also ensure that they go someplace that is safe, that nurtures their development, that challenges their mind, and that prepares them for school.

The current program is outdated. It does not go far enough in promoting and supporting high-quality child care programs. It does not do enough to safeguard the health and safety of children. It does not always ensure that children have continuity of care, nor does it provide sufficient protections for working families when their employment situations change. It does not focus enough on infant and toddler care. It does not require mandatory background checks for child care providers in this program.

So, today we are introducing a bill that makes needed changes to address shortcomings in current law.

Our bill requires States to devote more of their funding to quality initiatives, such as: training, professional development, and professional advancement of the child care workforce, supporting early learning guidelines, developing and implementing quality rating systems for providers, and improving the supply and quality of child care programs and services for infants and toddlers.

Our bill says that CCDBG providers must meet certain health and safety

requirements related to prevention and control of infectious diseases, first aid and CPR, child abuse prevention, administration of medication, prevention of and response to emergencies due to food allergies, prevention of sudden infant death syndrome and shaken baby syndrome, building and physical premises safety, and emergency response planning.

Our bill gives families more stability in the CCDBG program. It ensures that children in the program can get care for at least a year, even if their parent sees a change in their working status or income.

Our bill works to improve early childhood care by requiring States to spend a certain portion of their funding on infant and toddler quality initiatives. The bill requires States to develop and implement plans to increase the supply and quality of care for infants and toddlers, as well as children with disabilities and children receiving care during non-traditional work hours.

And our bill requires mandatory background checks for child care providers in the CCDBG program.

At the outset, I would like to say that most child care providers I have met and spoken with are wonderful, caring people committed to ensuring that the children in their care are safe and happy. This proposal is not meant to insinuate anything negative about our child care workforce.

Instead, it is simply meant to ensure that we are doing our due diligence to ensure that the adults entrusted with our children's day-to-day care are not murderers, child molesters, kidnappers, arsonists, drug dealers, or rapists. Background checks are required for many jobs and I believe they should be required for child care providers.

Every working parent with children, no matter their income level, worries about child care. What's affordable? What's accessible? Will my child be safe? Where can I get the very best care for my kid? The CCDBG program is supposed to give parents peace of mind. And for many families over many years, it has. But we can and should be doing more to improve child care for children, parents, and providers alike. It is long past time to revitalize, refresh, and reform this vitally important program.

Again, I would like to thank Senator BURR, Chairman HARKIN, Ranking Member ALEXANDER, and all members of the Senate HELP Committee for their hard work on this bipartisan proposal. It is my hope that we can move swiftly to get this bill passed out of House and Senate and onto the President's desk.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1144. Mr. MORAN (for himself and Mr. KING) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1145. Mr. BEGICH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1146. Mr. BENNET (for himself and Mr. ENZI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1147. Mr. PRYOR (for himself and Mr. HOEVEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1148. Mr. COWAN (for himself and Mr. PORTMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1149. Mr. SCHATZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1150. Mr. SCHATZ (for himself and Ms. HIRONO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1151. Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. RISCH, Mr. KING, and Mr. CRAPO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1152. Mr. COBURN (for himself and Mr. HARKIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1153. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1154. Ms. STABENOW (for Mr. WYDEN) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 588, to provide for donor contribution acknowledgments to be displayed at the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Visitor Center, and for other purposes.

SA 1155. Mr. FRANKEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1144. Mr. MORAN (for himself and Mr. KING) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title XII, insert the following:

SEC. 12. TRANSPORT AND DISPENSING OF CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES IN THE USUAL COURSE OF VETERINARY PRACTICE.

Section 302(e) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 822(e)) is amended—

(1) by striking “(e)” and inserting “(e)(1)”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) Notwithstanding paragraph (1), a registrant who is a veterinarian shall not be required to have a separate registration in order to transport and dispense controlled substances in the usual course of veterinary practice at a site other than the registrant's registered principal place of business or professional practice, so long as the site of transporting and dispensing is located in a State where the veterinarian is licensed to practice veterinary medicine and is not a principal place of business or professional practice.”.

SA 1145. Mr. BEGICH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize

agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 877, after line 18, add the following:

SEC. 6208. NATURAL GAS DISTRIBUTION UTILITY PILOT LOAN PROGRAM.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF PILOT LOAN PROGRAM.—Section 232(c) of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 6942(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(B), by striking “; and” and inserting a period; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) The natural gas distribution utility pilot loan program authorized by section 6208(b) of the Agriculture Reform, Food, and Jobs Act of 2013.”.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT OF PILOT LOAN PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator of the Rural Utilities Service shall establish a natural gas distribution utility pilot loan program to add cooperatives and municipally owned natural gas distribution utilities to the list of utilities eligible to receive loans from the Rural Utilities Service.

(2) PRIORITY.—In making loans authorized under paragraph (1), the Administrator of the Rural Utilities Service shall give priority to utilities located in areas that—

(A) have been designated as PM_{2.5} non-attainment areas by the Environmental Protection Agency; and

(B) pay more than 200 percent of national average for space heat on a dollar per Btu basis.

(3) FUNDING.—The Administrator of the Rural Utilities Service—

(A) shall carry out the loan pilot program using existing funds of the Rural Utilities Service; and

(B) shall not make loans under the loan pilot program in excess of \$500,000,000 over the duration of the program.

(4) DURATION.—The loan pilot program shall be authorized for a period of 5 years, beginning on the date of enactment of this Act.

(5) REPORT.—At the conclusion of the loan pilot program, the Administrator of the Rural Utilities Service shall complete a report examining—

(A) the economic benefits of providing low cost loans; and

(B) any upward price pressure on natural gas prices in the United States resulting from the loan pilot program.

SA 1146. Mr. BENNET (for himself and Mr. ENZI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 273, line 17 strike “. ”.

On page 273, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

“(3) FOREST SERVICE PARTICIPATION.—The Secretary (acting through the Chief of the Forest Service) may use funds derived from conservation-related programs executed on National Forest System land to carry out the ACES Program on National Forest System land.”.

SA 1147. Mr. PRYOR (for himself and Mr. HOEVEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 573, line 25, strike “\$4,226,000,000” and insert “\$5,726,000,000”.

On page 574, line 7, strike “\$3,026,000,000” and insert “\$4,526,000,000”.

On page 574, line 9, strike “\$1,000,000,000” and insert “\$2,500,000,000”.

SA 1148. Mr. COWAN (for himself and Mr. PORTMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 914, between lines 13 and 14, insert the following:

“(i) SOIL AMENDMENT STUDY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to assess which types of, and which practices associated with the use of, fertilizers, biostimulants, and soil amendments best achieve the goals described in paragraph (2).

“(2) GOALS.—The goals referred to in paragraph (1) are—

“(A) increasing organic matter content;

“(B) reducing atmospheric volatilization;

“(C) identifying cost-effective conservation or production practices that reduce or eliminate nutrient runoff or leaching into groundwater or other water sources; and

“(D) understanding current bioactivity or nutrient loads in soil.

“(3) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of receipt of funds to carry out this subsection, the Secretary shall make publicly available and submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report that—

“(A) describes the results of the study; and

“(B) identifies the types of, and practices using, fertilizers, biostimulants, and soil amendments that best achieve the goals identified in paragraph (2).”.

SA 1149. Mr. SCHATZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 396, strike lines 2 through 7 and insert the following:

SEC. 4201. ADDITIONAL AUTHORITY FOR PURCHASE OF FRESH FRUITS, VEGETABLES, AND OTHER SPECIALTY FOOD CROPS.

Section 10603 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 612c-4) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by striking “2012” and inserting “2018”;

(2) by redesignating subsections (a), (b), and (c) as subsections (b), (c), and (a), respectively; and

(3) by inserting after subsection (c) (as so redesignated) the following:

“(d) LOCAL PREFERENCE IN MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT.—To the maximum extent practicable, a memorandum of agreement between the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Defense related to the purchase of fresh fruits and vegetables under this section shall require that fruits and vegetables purchased under the agreement be locally grown (as determined by the Secretary).

“(e) PILOT GRANT PROGRAM FOR PURCHASE OF FRESH FRUITS AND VEGETABLES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Using amounts made available to carry out subsection (c), the Secretary of Agriculture shall conduct a pilot program under which the Secretary will give not more than 5 participating States the option of receiving a grant in an amount equal to the value of the commodities that the participating State would oth-

erwise receive under this section for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.

“(2) USE OF GRANT FUNDS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A participating State receiving a grant under this subsection may use the grant funds solely to purchase fresh fruits and vegetables for distribution to schools and service institutions in the State that participate in the food service programs under the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 51 et seq.) and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1771 et seq.).

“(B) LOCALLY GROWN.—To the maximum extent practicable, the fruits and vegetables shall be locally grown, as determined by the State.

“(3) SELECTION OF PARTICIPATING STATES.—The Secretary shall select participating States from applications submitted by the States.

“(4) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—

“(A) SCHOOL AND SERVICE INSTITUTION REQUIREMENT.—Schools and service institutions in a participating State shall—

“(i) maintain records of purchases of fresh fruits and vegetables made using the grant funds; and

“(ii) report to the State the records.

“(B) STATE REQUIREMENT.—Each participating State shall submit to the Secretary a report on the success of the pilot program in the State, including information on—

“(i) the amount and value of each type of fresh fruit and vegetable purchased by the State; and

“(ii) the benefit provided by the purchases in conducting the school food service in the State, including meeting school meal requirements.”.

SA 1150. Mr. SCHATZ (for himself and Ms. HIRONO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 1122, between lines 2 and 3, insert the following:

SEC. 121. LABELING REQUIREMENTS FOR KONA COFFEE.

Subtitle A of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1621 et seq.) (as amended by section 12104(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 211. LABELING REQUIREMENTS FOR KONA COFFEE.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—No person shall sell or offer, expose for sale, or transport Hawaii-grown green coffee packed in wholesale quantities outside the geographic region of production described in subsection (b) unless each container is conspicuously marked, stamped, printed, or labeled in the English language with the exact grade or lower grade for the green coffee or the term ‘offgrade’, as applicable.

“(b) GEOGRAPHIC REGION OF PRODUCTION.—For purposes of subsection (a), the geographic region of production is—

“(1) the State of Hawaii;

“(2) the island of Maui;

“(3) the island of Molokai;

“(4) the island of Oahu;

“(5) the island of Kauai;

“(6) the district of Ka’u on the island of Hawaii, as designated by the State of Hawaii Tax Map;

“(7) the district of Hamakua on the island of Hawaii, as designated by the State of Hawaii Tax Map; and

“(8) the North Kona and South Kona districts on the island of Hawaii, as designated by the State of Hawaii Tax Map.

“(c) PLACEMENT.—The grade statement shall appear on—

“(1) the label required under subsection (a); or

“(2) the container on the same panel as the declaration of identity required by the matter under the headings ‘Uniform Laws and Regulations’ and ‘Uniform Packaging and Labeling Regulation’ of section A of part IV of the National Institute of Standards and Technology handbook No. 130 (1993 edition), with amendments specified in section 4-93-2(a) of the Hawaii Administrative Rules.

“(d) CORRECTION.—Any label that is determined to be incorrect shall be corrected by complete obliteration of the incorrect information and substitution with the correct statement of fact.

“(e) LETTERS AND FIGURES.—The letters and figures used to meet the requirements of this section shall be of bold type and legible.

“(f) GRADE TERMS.—The grade terms shall be exactly as shown in sections 4-143-4, 4-143-5, and 4-143-6 of the Hawaii Administrative Rules (as in effect on the date of enactment of this section).”.

SA 1151. Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. RISCH, Mr. KING, and Mr. CRAPO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 421, between lines 3 and 4, insert the following:

SEC. 42 . . . AVAILABILITY OF VEGETABLES AS SUPPLEMENTAL FOODS UNDER WIC PROGRAM.

Section 17(f)(11) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1786(f)(11)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (D); and

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following:

“(C) VEGETABLES.—The regulation required under paragraph (1) shall not exclude or restrict the eligibility of any variety of fresh, whole, or cut vegetables (other than vegetables with added sugars, fats, or oils) from being provided as supplemental foods under the program under this section.”.

SA 1152. Mr. COBURN (for himself and Mr. HARKIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 421, between lines 3 and 4, insert the following:

SEC. 40 . . . DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS TO PROMOTE HEALTHY EATING AMONG SNAP RECIPIENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall carry out 2 demonstration projects in States that agree to plan, design, develop, and implement programs to eliminate purchases of unhealthful foods or beverages under the supplemental nutrition assistance program established under the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.).

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—In selecting States to carry out a demonstration project under this section, the Secretary shall ensure that each proposed demonstration project includes—

(1) a standard based on nutritional content that—

(A) is demonstrated to be clear, practical, and consistent in excluding certain items from eligibility;

(B) limits the use of benefits for purchasing foods or beverages that are identified in the most recent Dietary Guidelines for Americans published under section 301 of the National Nutrition Monitoring and Re-

lated Research Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5341) as foods, beverages, or food components that—

(i) are consumed in excessive amounts; and

(ii) may increase the risk of certain chronic diseases or conditions; and

(C) does not—

(i) expand the number of items otherwise eligible for assistance under the supplemental nutrition assistance program; or

(ii) classify alcoholic beverages, tobacco, and hot foods or hot food products ready for immediate consumption as eligible for assistance under that program;

(2) a description of the cost of implementing the demonstration project in the State;

(3) a description of the number of households participating in the supplemental nutrition assistance program to be affected by the demonstration project;

(4) a process for participating States to educate participants and retailers about eligible and ineligible foods, including a procedure for disseminating product eligibility information to participants and retailers periodically;

(5) a procedure to work with retailers to identify problems and best practices in implementing new product eligibility standards;

(6) a procedure to monitor and evaluate program operations, including the impact on participating households and small businesses;

(7) a statement that the demonstration project does not reduce the eligibility for, or amount of, benefits available under the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.);

(8) notwithstanding section 3(k) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2012(k)), complies with the requirements of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.);

(9) the ability of the State to meet the evaluation criteria under subsections (c) and (d); and

(10) any other requirements that the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

(c) CONSIDERATION.—In selecting States to carry out a demonstration project under this section, the Secretary shall consider whether a State has previously applied for a waiver under the supplemental nutrition assistance program to carry out a similar project.

(d) EVALUATION.—Not later than 2 years after the date on which a demonstration project is initiated under this section, the Secretary shall provide for an independent evaluation of the projects selected under this section that uses rigorous methodologies, particularly random assignment or other methods that are capable of producing scientifically valid information regarding effective restrictions to measure the impact of the pilot program on—

(1) the costs and benefits under the supplemental nutrition assistance program in the State;

(2) the access of individuals receiving benefits under the supplemental nutrition assistance program in the State to nutritious food;

(3) the dietary intake of—

(A) supplemental nutrition assistance program recipients participating in the supplemental nutrition assistance program demonstration project; and

(B) a control group of supplemental nutrition assistance program recipients not participating in the demonstration project; and

(4) other effects that the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

(e) COSTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—All costs associated with carrying out a pilot project and an evaluation of that pilot project under this section shall—

(A) be provided by the State; and

(B) not be eligible for administrative matching under section 16(a) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2025(a)).

(2) CONTRIBUTIONS.—A State may accept and use contributions from nongovernmental entities, including nonprofit organizations, to carry out a pilot project and an evaluation of that pilot project under this section.

SA 1153. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 986, between lines 4 and 5, insert the following:

SEC. 83 . . . EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN PAYMENTS FROM SEQUESTRATION ORDERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 255(g)(1)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 905(g)(1)(A)) is amended by inserting after “Payment to Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund (24-0200-0-1-805).” the following:

“Payments to Counties under the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 500 note; Public Law 106-393).

“Payments in lieu of taxes under chapter 69 of title 31, United States Code.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) takes effect on October 1, 2012.

SA 1154. Ms. STABENOW (for Mr. WYDEN) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 588, to provide for donor contribution acknowledgments to be displayed at the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Visitor Center, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. DONOR CONTRIBUTIONS.

Section 8905(b) of title 40, United States Code is amended by striking paragraph (7) and inserting the following:

“(7) DONOR CONTRIBUTIONS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this paragraph, the Secretary or Administrator, as applicable, may permit a sponsor described in subsection (a) to acknowledge donor contributions at the commemorative work.

“(B) REQUIREMENTS.—Acknowledgments shall—

“(i) be displayed inside a visitor center or other ancillary structure associated with the commemorative work; and

“(ii) conform to applicable National Park Service or General Services Administration guidelines for donor recognition, as applicable.

“(C) LIMITATIONS.—Acknowledgments shall—

“(i) be limited to an appropriate statement or credit recognizing the contribution;

“(ii) be displayed in a form approved by the Secretary or Administrator;

“(iii) be displayed for a period of time determined by the Secretary or Administrator to be appropriate, commensurate with the level of the contribution;

“(iv) be limited to short, discrete, and unobtrusive acknowledgments or credits; and

“(v) not include any advertising slogans or company logos.

“(D) SUBMITTAL OF PLAN.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Prior to the display of donor acknowledgments, the sponsor shall submit to the Secretary or Administrator, as applicable, for approval a plan for displaying the donor acknowledgments, including—

“(I) the sample text and types of acknowledgments to be displayed; and

“(II) the form and location of all displays.

“(ii) NOTIFICATION AND RESUBMITTAL.—If the Secretary or Administrator does not approve the plan submitted under clause (i), the Secretary or Administrator shall—

“(I) not later than 60 days after the date on which the plan is received, notify the sponsor of the reasons the plan is not approved; and

“(II) allow the sponsor to resubmit a revised donor acknowledgment plan.

“(E) COST.—The sponsor shall bear all expenses related to the display of donor acknowledgments.

“(F) APPLICABILITY.—This paragraph shall apply to any commemorative work dedicated after January 1, 2010.”.

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY FOR VIETNAM MEMORIAL VISITOR CENTER.

Section 6(b)(5) of Public Law 96-297 (16 U.S.C. 431 note; 124 Stat. 2851) is amended by striking “2014” and inserting “2018”.

SA 1155. Mr. FRANKEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 199, strike lines 11 through 24, and insert the following:

“(A) the level of natural resource and environment benefits resulting from existing and proposed conservation treatment on all applicable priority resource concerns; and

On page 200, line 1, strike “(E)” and insert “(B)”.

On page 200, beginning on line 4, strike “; and” and all that follows through “production” on line 8.

On page 206, line 9, strike “not less than 5” and insert “a limited number of”.

On page 210, line 2, insert “or improve” after “adopt”.

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that a hearing scheduled before the Subcommittee on Water and Power of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources has been postponed. This hearing was scheduled to be held on Thursday, June 6, 2013, at 2:30 p.m., in room 366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The purpose of this oversight hearing is to examine the progress made by Native Hawaiians toward stated goals of the Hawaiian Homelands Commission Act.

For further information, please contact Cisco Minthorn at (202) 224-4756 or Danielle Deraney at (202) 224-1219.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that a hearing has been scheduled before the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. The hearing will be held on Tuesday, June 11, 2013, at 10 a.m., in room 366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The purpose of the hearing is to receive testimony on the November 6, 2012 referendum on the political status

of Puerto Rico and the Administration's response.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the hearing record may do so by sending it to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, United States Senate, Washington, D.C. 20510-6150, or by e-mail to danielle.deraney@energy.senate.gov.

For further information, please contact Allen Stayman at (202) 224-7865 or Danielle Deraney at (202) 224-1219.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Committee on Indian Affairs will meet during the session of the Senate on June 12, 2013, in room SD-628 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing to consider the President's Nomination of Yvette Roubideaux, to be Director of the Indian Health Service, Department of Health and Human Services. (Re-appointment)

Those wishing additional information may contact the Indian Affairs Committee at (202) 224-2251.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VIETNAM VETERANS DONOR ACKNOWLEDGEMENT ACT OF 2013

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 588, which was received from the House and is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 588) to provide for donor contribution acknowledgments to be displayed at the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Visitor Center, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a Wyden amendment which is at the desk be agreed to, the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 1154) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: In the nature of a substitute)

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. DONOR CONTRIBUTIONS.

Section 8905(b) of title 40, United States Code is amended by striking paragraph (7) and inserting the following:

“(7) DONOR CONTRIBUTIONS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this paragraph, the Secretary or Administrator, as applicable, may permit a sponsor described in subsection (a) to ac-

knowledge donor contributions at the commemorative work.

“(B) REQUIREMENTS.—Acknowledgments shall—

“(i) be displayed inside a visitor center or other ancillary structure associated with the commemorative work; and

“(ii) conform to applicable National Park Service or General Services Administration guidelines for donor recognition, as applicable.

“(C) LIMITATIONS.—Acknowledgments shall—

“(i) be limited to an appropriate statement or credit recognizing the contribution;

“(ii) be displayed in a form approved by the Secretary or Administrator;

“(iii) be displayed for a period of time determined by the Secretary or Administrator to be appropriate, commensurate with the level of the contribution;

“(iv) be limited to short, discrete, and unobtrusive acknowledgments or credits; and

“(v) not include any advertising slogans or company logos.

“(D) SUBMITTAL OF PLAN.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Prior to the display of donor acknowledgments, the sponsor shall submit to the Secretary or Administrator, as applicable, for approval a plan for displaying the donor acknowledgments, including—

“(I) the sample text and types of acknowledgments to be displayed; and

“(II) the form and location of all displays.

“(ii) NOTIFICATION AND RESUBMITTAL.—If the Secretary or Administrator does not approve the plan submitted under clause (i), the Secretary or Administrator shall—

“(I) not later than 60 days after the date on which the plan is received, notify the sponsor of the reasons the plan is not approved; and

“(II) allow the sponsor to resubmit a revised donor acknowledgment plan.

“(E) COST.—The sponsor shall bear all expenses related to the display of donor acknowledgments.

“(F) APPLICABILITY.—This paragraph shall apply to any commemorative work dedicated after January 1, 2010.”.

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY FOR VIETNAM MEMORIAL VISITOR CENTER.

Section 6(b)(5) of Public Law 96-297 (16 U.S.C. 431 note; 124 Stat. 2851) is amended by striking “2014” and inserting “2018”.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H.R. 588), as amended, was read the third time and passed.

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, JUNE 4, 2013

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m. on Tuesday, June 4, 2013; that following the prayer and the pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business for 1 hour with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the majority controlling the first half and the Republicans controlling the final half; that

following morning business the Senate resume consideration of S. 954, the farm bill; further, that the Senate recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. to allow for the weekly caucus meetings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:55 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, June 4, 2013, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be general

LT. GEN. FRANK GORENC

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. PHILIP S. DAVIDSON

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 716:

To be major

DAISY Y. ENG

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUALS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant colonel

JOSEPH N. KENAN

To be major

SIRPA T. AUTIO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant colonel

SCOTT M. SHEFLIN

To be major

CHRISTOPHER F. TANA

ERIC J. TURNER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant colonel

CHRISTOPHER E. CIEURZO

CHARLES C. MARTINEAU

To be major

VINH Q. TRAN

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

JASON R. PURVIS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be colonel

THOMAS R. BOUCHARD

PETER M. EMERSON

JAMES M. HARMON

PHILLIP F. JOHNSON

JESSE J. KIRCHMEIER

ALEXANDER D. LAWSON

JAN M. OLSEN

ROBERT D. PARRISH II

JOHN A. ZENKER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

GEORGE T. BARIDO

LISA M. BROWN

DON S. COLT II

CYNTHIA S. KNYSAK

PETER B. OLSON

REGINA POWELL

MICHAEL N. PULLEN

KEVIN S. SHARP

MATTHEW A. SHEAFFER

CHARLES J. SIZEMORE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

TIMOTHY BARNARD

BRIAN R. BEA

FRED D. BICOY

GARY R. BRICKNER

DAVID W. BUTLER

LISA J. DEWITT

FREDDIE J. FRIEL

DAVID B. HALE

JAMES W. HALLIDAY, JR.

EDWIN P. HENDRICKS, JR.

LISA J. HOU

MARGUERITE L. KNOX

JAMES B. KYLE III

JOSHUA H. LIPSCHUTZ

MARTIN J. LUCENTI, JR.

BEN R. MALTZ

MICHAEL D. MCLEARY

LISA MERIWETHER

JEFFREY P. MILES

RICARDO MUNOZ, JR.

MARTIN D. ORTIZ

MICHAEL S. PIZZATO

SCOTT A. POCHA

MICHAEL S. RANDOLPH

SHAKTI S. SABHARWAL

STARRE M. SEIP

STACEY A. SMITH

ANGELA M. STEWARDHANDLE

JEFFREY A. STEWART

MICHAEL J. STURKIE

STEWART H. TANKERSLEY

OSCAR L. TROCHEMATOS

KEVIN D. VAUGHN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

JEFFREY S. ACREE

SAMUEL C. ALDRIDGE

JEAN M. ANDERSON

YOLANDA ANTHONY

JOSEPH S. ATKINS

KULVINDER S. BAJWA

LEE J. BARTON

PAULA M. BEHRENS

RICARDO J. BERRIOS

OMAR S. BHLAT

GEOFFREY BLOOMFIELD

JOHN H. BORDES, JR.

WILLIAM H. BOSWORTH

JACQUELINE J. BRADLEY

KEVIN M. BRADLEY

JOHN P. BRIDE, JR.

ARNOLD D. BRIDGES

MATTHEW D. BRIDGES

PATRICK A. BRIDIE

ANDREW T. BRYAN

JOHN R. BURCHFIELD

BRUCE E. BURNS

MARK A. CANNON

ROBERT P. CASILLAS

CATHERINE W. CATINA

MICHAEL J. CEPE

GREGORY H. CHOW

JULIA L. CHRISTIAN

ANTONIO DELAROSA

JAMES G. DELUCA

GLENNA J. DONOVAN

ANGELA M. DOUGLAS

MARC T. DOWNING

JEFFREY DREXLER

MARC R. DUCHETTE

ANNE M. EMSHOFF

LOUIS A. FLORES

PEDRO FLORESRUIZ

DIANE R. FORBES

KATHLEEN P. FOREMAN

CAROLYN L. FORRISI

AMELIA J. FOSTER

ALAN G. GETTS

STEVEN L. GLORSKY

THOMAS S. GRANCHI

JAMES L. HALEY

JONATHAN P. HALISCAK

LUCY A. HALL

HUNTER A. HAMMILL

JEFFREY K. HARPSTRITE

BERNARD S. HARRISON

KENT E. HARSHBARGER

DANIEL W. HASH

CHERYL A. HENDRIX

PETER J. HENSLEY

DAVID R. HINCKLEY

JON A. HINMAN

DIANA M. HOEK

PHILLIP S. HOLMES

GREGORY B. HUGHES

ERMA J. JACKSON

JONI J. JOHNSON

CYRUS KARIMIAN

MICHAEL S. KILLEN

DAVID G. KING

LISA A. KLATKA

FRANCIS W. KLOTZ

STEVEN M. KOSTRZEWA

DIXON A. LACKEY III

LOREN S. LASATER

JOHN S. LEE

PAUL J. LEE

JOHN F. LOPINTO

DAVID G. LUKENS

EARL H. LYNCH

KATHLEEN A. MALONE

GEORGE G. MANLONGAT

JENNIFER A. MARRASTHOST

STEVEN R. MCCOLLEY

DANA E. MCDANIEL

MARY E. MCCLAUGHLIN

MICHELLE C. MCCLAUGHLIN

MARTIN E. MENOSKY

PAUL F. MESSINA

GABRIELLA G. MILLER

JACQUELINE C. MITCHELL

BRIAN A. MONTGOMERY

CLARA E. MOSES

ROBERT L. MOSSER

THOMAS J. MURPHY

CLAYTON H. NASH

MITCHELL NAZARIO

REGINA C. NOETH

MATTHEW P. NOVAK

EDWARD E. ORONSAYE

MARIA E. OSTRANDER

NOEL C. PACE

JIMMY A. PAULK

EILEEN A. PILLMEIER

JEFFERY S. PORTER

MELODY A. QUESENBERRY

MARGARET J. RAMSDELL

PETER D. RAY

FREDERICK A. REMICK, JR.

RANDY F. RIZOR

MICHAEL A. ROWLEY

MARIA SANTIAGOSOSA

WILLIAM D. SCHAEFER

PAUL J. SCHENARTS

DUANE R. SHARPE

SHIRLEY A. SPENCER

JOHN F. STECKER III

KENNETH E. STONE

MICHAEL C. STYPULA

ERIC J. TOBIASON

CAROLINE A. TOFFOLI

DIANE TRAVER

ELIZABETH M. TRINIDAD

ELIZABETH S. TUGAS

EDWARD L. VANOEVEREN

SUSAN L. B. WALTON

SANDRA M. WANER

CALVIN W. WASHINGTON

MELINDA L. WELLBORN

FRANCIS X. WHALEN

JEFFREY L. WILSON

JASON R. WING

VICKY L. YOUNG

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be lieutenant colonel

MAZEN ABBAS

JULIE A. AKE

JOSEPH F. ALDERETE, JR.

SHANE ANDERSON

JARED M. ANDREWS

JALSON L. BATIG

ADRIANA C. BEATTY

STEPHEN BECKWITH

ROBERT BEJNAROWICZ

JENNIFER L. BELL

CHAD L. BENDER

JASON W. BENNETT

EDWARD C. BERGEN

NICI E. BOWWELL

REBECCA A. BOUCHER

BRANDON D. BROWN

JON S. CAMP

SUYOUNG CHANG

JASON COLEMAN

JACOB F. COLLEN

MISTY C. COWAN

JOHN M. CSOKMAY

JEANCLAUDE G. DALLEYRAND

PATRICK DEFENBROCK

JUSTIN P. DODGE

DAVID M. DOMAN

DAVID DURUSSEL

NICOLE M. EHRLHARDT

TRACY L. EICHEL

DAVID ESCOBEDO

PAUL M. FAESTEL

DEAN R. FELLABAUM

KATHLEEN M. FLOCKE

MICHELLE L. FONTAINE

LEVI FUNCHES
 DANIEL J. GALLAGHER
 DALE W. GEORGE
 RUSSELL GIESE
 JASON A. GRASSBAUGH
 ADAM T. GROTH
 REY D. L. GUMBOC
 MATTHEW B. HARRISON
 JOSHUA D. HARTZELL
 ALAN F. HELMBOLD
 DAVID C. HILE
 GUYON J. HILL
 SEAN J. HIPPI
 MICHAEL C. HJELKREM
 MATTHEW H. HOEFER
 JOSEPH HUDAK
 JOHN R. HUGHES
 ADAM L. HUILLET
 STEPHEN P. HYLAND
 NICHOLAS JASZCZAK
 JEREMY N. JOHNSON
 YANG E. KAO
 SEAN C. KEENAN
 PATRICK R. KENNY
 SAMEER D. KHATRI
 STEVEN W. KHOO
 DANIEL E. KIM
 JONATHAN KITCHIN
 JEFFREY S. KUNZ
 GREGORY LACY
 JASON S. LANHAM
 MATTHEW A. LAUDIE
 MARK Y. LEE
 ERIK K. LUNDMARK
 JONATHAN B. LUNDY
 RODD E. MARCUM
 KATHARINE W. MARKELL
 PETER K. MARLIN
 VINCENT J. MASE, JR.
 SHANNON M. MASNERI
 GABRIELLE MAYBEE
 DANIRA H. MAYES
 KRISTI MCKINNEY
 JOHN J. MCPHERSON
 NIA R. MIDDLETON
 CRISTIN A. MOUNT
 GEORGE R. MOUNT
 THORNTON MU
 TERRY L. MUELLER
 PETER D. MUENCH
 JAMALAH A. MUNIR
 KEITH P. MYERS
 ANICETO J. NAVARRO
 NICHOLAS J. NOCE

WILLIAM D. O'CONNELL
 MICHEAL A. ODLE
 BRUCE A. ONG
 JUAN A. ORTIZPEREZ
 JAMES J. PARK
 JEFFREY T. PARKER
 JONATHAN R. PARKS
 CHRISTOPHER T. PERRY
 WYLAN C. PETERSON
 TRAVIS PFANNENSTIEL
 ERIC PRYOR
 ANITA F. QURESHI
 JASON A. REGULES
 JAMIE C. RIESBERG
 JEFFREY L. ROBERTSON
 MARK J. ROSCHEWSKI
 KIMBERLY C. SALAZAR
 DENNIS M. SARMIENTO
 DAVID J. SCHWARTZ
 DEREK K. SEAQUIST
 MARK SHASHIKANT
 ROBERT SHIH
 NATHAN M. SHUMWAY
 JOSEPH SHVIDLER
 CARL G. SKINNER
 JOHN W. SONG
 DARREN C. SPEARMAN
 MICHAEL P. STANY
 JOSEPH R. STERBIS
 TOIHUNTA STUBBS
 GUY H. TAKAHASHI
 SCOT A. TEBO
 ARTIN TERHAKOPIAN
 WESLEY M. THEURER
 JOHN E. THOMAS
 ROY F. THOMAS
 JEFFREY M. TIEDE
 MICHAEL TODD
 DAWN M. TORRES
 JAIME L. TORRES II
 DAVID B. TROWBRIDGE
 DAVID A. VAN DE CAR
 JEFFERY W. VANDENBROEK
 KATRINA E. WALTERS
 SCOTT M. WATERMAN
 JAMES A. WATTS
 MICHAEL A. WIGGINS
 JOSHUA S. WILL
 GARY H. WYNN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
 TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY
 DENTAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624
 AND 3064:

To be lieutenant colonel

EDWARD T. BREECHER
 JASON BULLOCK
 LLENA C. CALDWELL
 PAUL COLTHIRST
 LUKE K. DALZELL
 CHAD V. DAWSON
 JEAN R. ELYSEE
 CYNTHIA V. FELEPPA
 THOMAS M. JOHNSON
 YOUNG S. KANG
 DENNIS J. KANTANEN
 PETER KIM
 JAYANTHI KONDAMANI
 LOUIS R. KUBALA
 CHARLES C. LAMBERT
 BENJAMIN R. METHVIN
 JUSTIN N. NAYLOR
 WADE H. OWENS
 MANUEL PELAEZ
 MICHAEL PICCIONE
 CONSTANCE L. SEDON
 THOMAS STARK
 STEPHEN TURELLA
 LEWIS WAYT
 DEMETRES WILLIAMS
 EDWARD M. WISE, JR.

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR APPOINTMENT
 TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY
 UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be commander

KIMBERLY K. YEAGER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT
 TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
 UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

JAMES D. HARRISON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
 IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY
 UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant commander

KERRIE L. ADAMS
 AMANDA FEIGEL
 ANTONIA J. HENRY